

*There is no Title Published
for this Vol*
THE

NATIONAL REVIEW.

No. XXXVI.

APRIL 1864.

London:

Chapman and Hall, 193 Piccadilly.

AGENTS:—Dublin: M'Glashan and Gill. Edinburgh: J. Menzies.
Glasgow: Murray and Son.

[PRICE SIX SHILLINGS.]

C
I
C
I
I
n
C
i
S
I
S
C
C
s
C
I
I
T
T
C
I
I
S
th
S
H
H
m
of
in
W

National Review Advertiser.

APRIL 1864.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.

BOOKS FOR ALL READERS.

ONE THOUSAND COPIES of Froude's History of the Reign of Elizabeth; many Copies of Forster's Life of Eliot, Kirk's History of Charles the Bold, The Roman and the Teuton, by Charles Kingsley, The Diary of Mary Countess Cowper, The Mauritius and Madagascar, by Bishop Ryan, Lady Strangford's Visit to the Eastern Shores of the Adriatic, Keble's Life of Bishop Thomas Wilson, and Forsyth's Life of Cicero; more than One Thousand Copies of Speke's Discovery of the Source of the Nile; many Copies of Eastwick's Travels in Persia, Rambles in the Deserts of Syria, Carlyle's Life of Frederick, Vol. IV., Smiles's Industrial Biography, the Lives of Andrew Reed, Edward Irving, Bishop Mackenzie, Theodore Parker, William Blake, James Sherman, Dr. Leifchild, Bishop Blomfield, George Calixtus, Giuseppe Giusti, Father Mathew, W. H. Prescott, and Dr. Lyman Beecher; One Thousand Copies of The Small House at Allington; One Thousand Copies of Rachel Ray; many Copies of Barbara's History, Clara Vaughan, Beppo the Conscript, Wait for the End, Trevlyn Hold, John Marchmont's Legacy, Ella Norman, Adela Cathcart, Denise, Hard Cash, The Trials of the Tredgolds, Baptista, Hannah Thurston, Romola, and other Popular Novels; more than One Thousand Copies of Kinglake's Crimea; many Copies of Hawthorne's Old Home, Pattison's Religious Life in England, Sermons and Lectures, by Dean Stanley, Dr. Howson, Dr. Hannah, Baldwin Brown, Dr. Wiseman, the Bishop of Oxford, &c.; Caxtoniana, Mayhew's Saxony, Their Majesties' Servants, by Dr. Doran, Hood's Cruise of the Fawn, Lewin's Siege of Jerusalem, Charles Knight's Autobiography, Human Sadness, by the Countess de Gasparin, Kirwan's Host and Guest, The Life of General Sir William Napier, Howitt's History of the Supernatural, and every other Work of acknowledged merit and general interest, are in circulation at MUDIE'S LIBRARY.

Fresh Copies of the above Works, and every other leading Book of the season, continue to be added to the Library as the demand increases, and an ample supply is provided of all the principal New Works as they appear.

FIRST-CLASS SUBSCRIPTION,

ONE GUINEA PER ANNUM AND UPWARDS,

According to the number of Volumes required.

Prospectuses postage free on application.

CHARLES EDWARD MUDIE, NEW OXFORD STREET, LONDON.

CITY OFFICE: 4 KING STREET, CHEAPSIDE.

BRANCH ESTABLISHMENTS: CROSS STREET, MANCHESTER; AND TEMPLE STREET, BIRMINGHAM.

WORKS SUITABLE FOR YOUNG PERSONS.

A Glimpse of the World. By the Author of "Amy Herbert." Fep. 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

Impressions of Rome, Florence, and Turin. By the same Author. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Passing Thoughts on Religion. By the same Author. Eighth Edition. Fep. 8vo, 5s.

History of the Early Church, from the first Preaching of the Gospel to the Council of Nicea. By the same Author. Second Edition. Fep. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Ancient History of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia. On the same plan as "A First History of Greece," and "The Child's First History of Rome," by the same Author. With 2 Coloured Maps. Fep. 8vo, 6s.

A First History of Greece, from the *Siege of Troy*, B.C. 1184, to the *Destruction of Corinth*, B.C. 146. By the same Author. New Edition, revised. Fep. 8vo, price 3s. 6d.

The Child's First History of Rome, from the Foundation of Rome, B.C. 753, to the Fall of Jerusalem under Titus, A.D. 70. By the same Author. Eleventh Edition. Fep. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Journal kept during a Summer Tour, for the Children of a Village School: from Ostend to the Lake of Constance, thence to the Simplon, and through part of the Tyrol to Genoa. By the same Author. Fep. 8vo, 5s.

Dictation Exercises: Being a New English Spelling-Book founded on the principle, now generally admitted, that ORTHOGRAPHY should be taught by the Eye rather than the Ear. By the same Author. Third Edition. 18mo, 1s.

Contes Faciles: a Selection of Amusing Stories from Modern French Writers; intended to give Children an interest in reading when they are beginning to understand the language, and to precede "Extraits Choisis." Revised Edition. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Extraits Choisis des Auteurs Modernes: or, Advanced French Reading-Book; comprising pieces of considerable length selected from the best Writings of VICTOR HUGO, ALEXANDRE DUMAS, BUNGENER, LAMARTINE, EMILE SOUVESTRE, E. M. DE ST. HILAIRE, ALPHONSE KARR, GUIZOT, and DE DAMAS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Night Lessons from Scripture. By the Author of "Amy Herbert." 32mo, price 3s.

Readings for Every Day in Lent. Compiled from the Writings of Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. By the same Author. Fifth Edition, thoroughly revised. Fep. 8vo, 5s.

Self-Examination before Confirmation: with Devotions and Directions for Confirmation-Day. By the same Author. New Edition, revised. 32mo, price 1s. 6d.

Readings for a Month Preparatory to Confirmation: compiled from the Works of the Writers of the Early and of the English Church. By the same Author. New Edition. Fep. 8vo, 4s.

Thoughts for the Holy Week for Young Persons. By the same Author. Second Edition. Fep. 8vo, price 2s.

Preparation for the Holy Communion: the Devotions compiled chiefly from the Works of Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. By the same Author. 32mo, 3s.

Stories and Tales by the Author of "Amy Herbert." New and cheaper collected Edition, each Tale or Story complete in a single volume:

Amy Herbert, 2s. 6d.

Gertrude, 2s. 6d.

The Earl's Daughter, 2s. 6d.

The Experience of Life, 2s. 6d.

Cleve Hall, 3s. 6d.

Ivors, 3s. 6d.

Katharine Ashton, 3s. 6d.

Margaret Percival, 5s.

Laneton Parsonage, 4s. 6d.

Ursula, 4s. 6d.

LONDON: LONGMAN, GREEN, AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

NEW WORKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

ESSAYS ON THE ADMINISTRATIONS OF GREAT BRITAIN from 1783 to 1830. By the Right Hon. Sir G. C. LEWIS, Bart. Edited by the Right Hon. Sir E. HEAD, Bart. 8vo, with Portrait, price 15s.

EASTERN EUROPE AND WESTERN ASIA: Political and Social Sketches on Russia, Greece, and Syria in 1831-2-3. By HENRY ARTHUR TILLEY. Post 8vo, with Six Illustrations, price 10s. 6d.

SIR JOHN ELIOT: a Biography; 1590—1632. By JOHN FORSTER. With Two Portraits, from the Originals at Port Eliot. 2 Vols. crown 8vo, price 30s.

THE REIGNS OF EDWARD VI. AND MARY; being Vols. V. and VI. of the "History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth." By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. Second Edition, price 28s.

THE GLADIATORS. By G. J. WHYTE MELVILLE. Second Edition, complete in 1 Vol. price 5s. with Frontispiece after Gérôme's celebrated Picture, "Ave Cæsar Imperator! Morituri te salutant!"

BACON'S ESSAYS; with Annotations. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., late Archbishop of Dublin. Sixth Edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

AN OUTLINE OF THE NECESSARY LAWS OF THOUGHT: a Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic. By the Most Rev. W. THOMSON, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York. Seventh Thousand. Crown 8vo, 5s. 6d.

HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN SPAIN AND SCOTLAND. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. Second Edition. 8vo, 16s.

By the same Author,

HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE. Third Edition, 8vo, 21s.

ON LIBERTY. By JOHN STUART MILL. Third Edition. Post 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

A DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By R. G. LATHAM, M.A., F.R.S. Founded on that of Dr. JOHNSON, as Edited by the Rev. H. J. TODD. 2 Vols. 4to, in 36 Monthly Parts, 3s. 6d. each.

[Part III. on April 30th]

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD AND OF HIS PRECURSOR JOHN THE BAPTIST, as represented in Christian Art. By Mrs. JAMESON and Lady EASTLAKE. Being the Fourth Series of Sacred and Legendary Art. 2 Vols. square crown 8vo, with Etchings and Woodcuts. *[In April.]*

PEOPLE'S EDITION OF THE LIFE OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON. By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Revised and abridged from the larger Work, with copious Additions from Authentic Sources. 1 Vol. crown 8vo, of 500 pages, with Portrait, price 5s.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE LATE WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, M.P. for the County of York, during nearly Thirty Years. By JOHN S. HARFORD, D.C.L., F.R.S. Post 8vo. *[In April.]*

FATHER MATHEW: a Biography. By JOHN FRANCIS MAGUIRE, M.P. Second Edition, revised; with Portrait and Vignette. Post 8vo, 12s. 6d.

ESSAYS ON FICTION; comprising Articles on Sir W. Scott, Sir E. B. Lytton, Colonel Senior, W. M. Thackeray, and Mrs. Beecher Stowe, contributed to the *Edinburgh and Quarterly* and other Reviews. By NASSAU W. SENIOR. Post 8vo. *[Ready.]*

BLACKFRIARS; or, The Monks of Old: a Romantic Chronicle. 3 Vols. post 8vo, price 31s. 6d.

LONDON: LONGMAN, GREEN, AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

Chapman and Hall's New Publications.

MR. CARLYLE'S FREDERICK THE GREAT.

In demy 8vo, with Portrait and Maps, Vol. IV., 20s.

HISTORY OF FRIEDRICH THE SECOND, Called Frederick the Great.

By THOMAS CARLYLE.

[Now ready.]

In 2 Volumes, post 8vo, with Illustrations,

THE LIFE OF LAURENCE STERNE.

By PERCY FITZ-GERALD, M.A., M.R.I.A.

[Now ready.]

In 1 Volume, demy 8vo, with Portrait,

THE LIFE OF GENERAL WOLFE.

By R. WRIGHT.

[Nearly ready.]

GEORGE MEREDITH'S NEW NOVEL.

In 3 Volumes, post 8vo,

EMILIA IN ENGLAND.

By GEORGE MEREDITH.

Author of "The Ordeal of Richard Feverel," "The Shaving of Shagpat," &c.

[Nearly ready.]

In post 8vo, with Map,

OUR GARRISONS IN THE WEST; Or, Sketches in British North America.

By FRANCIS DUNCAN, M.A.

Fellow of the Geological Society; Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society; Member of Colonies' Committee, Society of Arts; D.C.L. King's College, N.S.; Lieutenant R.A.

[Now ready.]

In 1 Volume, demy 8vo, with Illustrations,

THROUGH MACEDONIA TO THE ALBANIAN LAKES.

By MARY ADELAIDE WALKER.

[Nearly ready.]

A New Edition, in 3 Volumes, fcp. 8vo,

ROBERT BROWNING'S POETICAL WORKS.

VOL. I. LYRICS, ROMANCES, MEN AND WOMEN 7s. 0d.
" II. TRAGEDIES, AND OTHER PLAYS 8s. 0d.
" III. PARACELUS, CHRISTMAS EVE, AND EASTER-DAY, AND SORDELLO. 7s. 6d.

* * Sold separately.

Sixth Edition, in 4 Volumes, fcp. 8vo, with Portrait, 24s.

ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING'S POETICAL WORKS.

'Including "AURORA LEIGH."

New and Cheaper Edition, post 8vo, with 40 Illustrations, 7s. 6d.

OLIVER GOLDSMITH.

A Biography. By JOHN FORSTER.

CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193 PICCADILLY.

NEW WORKS NOW READY.

LIFE OF GENERAL SIR WILLIAM NAPIER, K.C.B., Author of the "History of the Peninsular War," with extracts from his Correspondence. Edited by H. A. BRUCE, M.P. Portraits. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 28s.

RAMBLES AMONG THE TRIBES OF THE SYRIAN DESERTS. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

DIARY OF MARY COUNTESS COWPER, LADY OF THE BEDCHAMBER TO CAROLINE PRINCESS OF WALES, 1714-20. Portrait. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE PRINCE CONSORT'S SPEECHES AND ADDRESSES, with an INTRODUCTION. Popular Edition. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

THE ANCIENT MONARCHIES OF THE EAST. By REV. GEORGE RAWLINSON. Vol. II.—Assyria. With 230 Illustrations. 8vo. 16s.

THE METALLURGY OF IRON AND STEEL. By JOHN PERCY, F.R.S. With 4 large Plans and 200 Illustrations to Scale. (950 pp.) 8vo. 42s.

THE DIARY OF A DUTIFUL SON. By the late T. G. FONNEREAU. Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

THE WESTERN CATHEDRALS OF ENGLAND: Bristol, Gloucester, Hereford, Worcester, and Lichfield. By RICHARD J. KING, B.A. Illustrations. Post 8vo. 16s.

PRISON DISCIPLINE: a Report adopted at the Hampshire Quarter Sessions, January 1864. With a Preface. By LORD CARNARVON. 8vo. 1s.

THE RIVER AMAZONS: a Record of Adventures during Eleven Years of Travel. By H. W. BATES. New and Cheaper Edition. Illustrations. Post 8vo. 12s.

LIFE OF CICERO: his Character, viewed as a Statesman, Orator, and Friend. With his Correspondence and Orations. By WILLIAM FORSYTH, Q.C. Illustrations. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 18s.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN, from Geological Evidences; with Remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by variation. By SIR CHARLES LYELL, F.R.S. Third Edition, revised. Illustrations. 8vo. 14s.

MR. GLADSTONE'S FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, 1853, '60, and '63; also his SPEECHES ON TAX-BILLS, 1861, and CHARITIES, 1863. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE; its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History. By Various Writers. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Illustrations. Complete in 3 vols. Medium 8vo. 105s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE POETICAL WORKS, *Published and Unpublished*, of LORD HOUGHTON. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

HISTORY OF CHARLES THE BOLD, DUKE OF BURGUNDY. By J. FOSTER KIRK. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

THE STUDENT'S MANUAL OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. By T. B. SHAW. A new Edition, revised. Edited, with Notes and Illustrations, by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE MUSIC OF THE MOST ANCIENT NATIONS; particularly of the Assyrians, Egyptians, and Hebrews; with Special Reference to the Discoveries in Western Asia and in Egypt. By CARL ENGEL. Illustrations. 8vo. [Next week.]

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

THE POPULAR SCIENCE REVIEW.

No. XI., for April 1864, price 2s. 6d., contains:

On Printing Telegraphy, by R. S. CULLEY, with Page Illustration; Herring Fisheries, by the Editor; Microscopic Fungi, by M. C. COOKE, with Two Coloured Illustrations; On Proper Clothing, by Dr. LANKESTER, F.R.S.; Absorption and Radiation of Heat, by Professor DEBUS, F.R.S., with Two-page Illustration; Botanical Exercises, by the Rev. G. HENSLOW, M.A., F.L.S.; Pre-historic Dwellings, by G. E. ROBERTS, F.A.S.L., with Page Illustrations; Reviews of Books; Summary in Agriculture, Astronomy, Botany, Chemistry, Geology, Medical Sciences, Metallurgy, Mechanics, Photography, Physics, Zoology, and Comparative Anatomy. Illustrated by the best Artists. Quarterly, 2s. 6d.; Annual, 10s.

640 pages, crown 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

The Stream of Life on our Globe; its Archives, Traditions, and Laws, as revealed by Modern Discoveries in Geology and Palaeontology; a Sketch, in Untechnical Language, of the Beginning and Growth of Life, and the Physiological Laws which govern its Progress and Operations. By J. L. MILTON, Surgeon to St. John's Hospital for Skin Diseases, Westminster. Contents: The Beginning of Life—England, long, long ago—The First Dwellers on Earth—The First Builders—The First Wanderers—The First Colonists of Sacred History—The First Language—The First Alphabet—The Battle of Life—Glances at the Laws of Life—Life in the Blood—Life in the Nerves—Life of a Giant—Life of Men of Genius—Life of the Waters—Life in the Stars.

DR. WYNTER'S WORKS, 3 vols., Complete, 18s.

Second Edition, crown 8vo, price 6s.

Subtle Brains and Lissom Fingers; being some of the chisel-marks of our industrial and scientific progress, and other papers. By A. WYNTER, M.D., M.R.C.P., London. Containing 39 articles, amongst which will be found: Fraudulent Trade Marks—A Day with the Coroner—Undersea Railroad—Vivisection—Restoration of our Soil—Railways the Great Civilisers—Physical Education—Clerk of the Weather—Village Hospitals—Air Fraction—Illuminations—Boat Building by Machinery—Doctors' Stuff—Smallpox in London—Excursion Trains—Early Warnings, &c.

By the same Author.

Seventh Edition, price 6s.

Our Social Bees; Pictures of Town and Country Life, and other papers, containing 45 articles, among which will be found: London Smoke—Mock Auctions—The Suction Post—Our Peck of Dirt—The Artificial Man—Britannia's Smelling Bottle—The Post-Office—Commercial Grief—Aërated Bread—Needle-making—Preserved Meats—Wenham Lake Ice—Turkish Baths—Who is Mr. Reuter?—Candle-making—London Stout—Sewing Machines—Physical Antipathies—Ocean Horticulture—Brain Difficulties—Human Hair, &c.

Also, crown 8vo, Seventh Edition, price 6s.

Curiosities of Civilisation; containing: The London Commissariat—Food and its Adulterations—Advertisements—The Zoological Gardens—Rats—Woolwich Arsenal—Shipwrecks—Lodging, Food, and Dress of Soldiers—The Electric Telegraph—Fires and Fire Insurance—The Police and the Thieves—Mortality in Trades and Professions—Lunatic Asylums.

To all Lovers of our British Wild Flowers.

Monthly Parts at 5s. Now ready, Vols. I. and II. (7 Parts each), complete in cloth, 38s.; half-morocco, 42s.; whole-morocco, 48s. 6d.

English Botany: Descriptions and Drawings of every British Wild Flower, Life-size, and coloured to Nature by Hand-painting.

Volume I. contains all the Rues, Anemones, Crowfoots, Spearworts, Waterlilies, Poppies, Fumitories, Mustards, Rockets, Stocks, Lady's Smocks, Cresses, and other Plants ranked under the Natural Orders Ranunculaceæ to Cruciferae.

Volume II. contains all the Mignonettes, Rockroses, Pansies, Sundews, Milkworts, Pinks, Catchflies, Campions, Chickweeds, Stitchworts, Sandworts, Pearlworts, Spurreys, Waterworts, St. John's Worts, Mallows, Flaxes, Crane's Bills, Geraniums, and other Plants ranked under the Natural Orders Resedacæ to Sapindacæ.

As all the Parts are kept in print, Subscribers can commence taking the work whenever they like. Any body desirous of seeing the work can do so by application to the Publisher, who will afford facilities for Booksellers to show it to their customers.

LONDON: ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192 PICCADILLY.

Macmillan and Co.'s New List.

Nearly ready, in 8vo, Vols. III. and IV.'

History of Normandy and England. By Sir FRANCIS PALGRAVE, Completing the History to the Death of William Rufus. Edited by F. T. PALGRAVE, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

Uniform with the above,

History of Normandy and England. By Sir FRANCIS PALGRAVE, Vol. I. 8vo, cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*; Vol. II. 8vo, cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.* These Volumes can still be had separately.

8vo, cloth, 12*s.*

The Roman and the Teuton: a Series of Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. By the Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY, M.A., Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge.

8vo, cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

The History of Tacitus. Translated into English by ALFRED JOHN CHURCH, M.A., of Lincoln College, Oxford, and WILLIAM JACKSON BRODRIBB, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With Notes and a Map.

In the Press,

A History of the Mathematical Theory of Probability, from PASCAL to LAPLACE. By I. TODHUNTER, M.A., F.R.S.

Now ready, 8vo, cloth, 14*s.*

Plutology; or, the Theory of the Efforts to Satisfy Human Wants. By WILLIAM EDWARD HEARN, LL.D., Professor of History and Political Economy in the University of Melbourne.

Now ready, crown 8vo,

Words and Places; or, Etymological Illustrations of History, Ethnology, and Geography. By the Rev. ISAAC TAYLOR, M.A.

This day, 11th Edition, fcp. 8vo, 4*s.*

On the Study of Words. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin.

This day is published, crown 8vo, cloth, 5*s.*, with Portrait,

Memoir of Robert Alfred Vaughan, Author of "Hours with the Mystics," &c. By ROBERT VAUGHAN, D.D. Second Edition, Revised and enlarged.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Tuscan Poet Giuseppe Giusti, and his Times. With a Selection from Giusti's own Correspondence and from his most celebrated Poems. By SUSAN HORNER.

Now ready, crown 8vo, with a Portrait of William Thompson, and a Map of the Seat of War in Waikato.

The Maori King; or, the Story of our Quarrel with the Natives of New Zealand. By J. E. GORST, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; and recently Commissioner of the Waikato District, New Zealand.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 6*s.*

Seven Months' Residence in Russian Poland in 1863. By the Rev. FORTESCUE L. M. ANDERSON, B.A.

FOR AN ACCOUNT OF AUSTRIAN POLAND, SEE

Across the Carpathians. With History of Galicia and Description of Cracow. Crown 8vo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Shortly will be published,

Vacation Tourists, and Notes of Travel in 1862-3. Edited by FRANCIS GALTON, F.R.S.

Now ready, Three Vols., crown 8vo, cloth, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

Clara Vaughan. A Novel.

LONDON AND CAMBRIDGE.

Chapman and Hall's New Publications.

In demy 8vo, 22s.

ENGLISH WRITERS: THE WRITERS BEFORE CHAUCER.

With an Introductory Sketch of the Four Periods of English Literature.
By HENRY MORLEY.

"Mr. Morley does all that learning, industry, and a real love for the subject can do to complete the intellectual record from all remaining sources. . . . We do not hesitate to say that the work will be a monument of learning, and an essential portion of every complete library."—*Daily News*.

"Mr. Morley's history of English literature gives us hopes that the want of an adequate text-book on a most important subject may at last be worthily supplied. . . . The book is a very useful and good one, and holds a distinct place in English literature."—*The Reader*.

DYCE'S SHAKESPEARE.

"THE BEST TEXT OF SHAKESPEARE WHICH HAS YET APPEARED. . . . MR. DYCE'S EDITION IS A GREAT WORK, WORTHY OF HIS REPUTATION; AND FOR THE PRESENT IT CONTAINS THE STANDARD TEXT."—*Times*, January 20, 1864.

A New Edition, to be completed in 8 Volumes, demy 8vo, 10s. each.

THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE.

Edited by the Rev. ALEXANDER DYCE.

This edition is not a mere reprint of that which appeared in 1857: on the contrary, it will present a text very materially altered and amended from beginning to end, with a large body of critical Notes almost entirely new; and with a Glossary, in which the language of the poet, his allusions to customs, &c., will be fully explained.

To be published every alternate Month. Vols. I. and II. now ready.

Collected Edition, in 3 Volumes, fcap. 8vo, 16s.

HENRY TAYLOR'S PLAYS AND POEMS:

"PHILIP VAN ARTEVELDE," &c.

"The lovers of poetical literature will be glad to welcome, in a uniform and convenient shape, the various poems Mr. Taylor has given to the world. They are all in one or other degree remarkable. . . . Besides the author's *chef-d'œuvre*, 'Philip Van Artevelde,' we have here 'Isaac Comnenus,' 'Edwin the Fair,' 'A Sicilian Summer,' 'St. Clement's Eve,' 'The Eve of the Conquest,' and some minor poems."—*London Review*.

Third and cheaper Edition, in 1 volume, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

ROBA DI ROMA.

By W. W. STORY.

"Whoever reads this book will rise from its perusal as well acquainted with the out-of-doors life of Rome as if he had spent years in the Eternal City. Nothing calculated to fix the attention or excite the interest of a stranger is omitted by Mr. Story in the ample record of his experience, which teems with the most vivid recollections, and is expressed by the most picturesque details. An enumeration of the contents of his volumes is like the bill of fare of a promising dinner, and the contents themselves resemble the dinner when the cookery is first-rate."—*Examiner*.

"Be the cause what it may, the fact is certain, that people never get tired of living at Rome, and people apparently never get tired of reading about Rome. . . . All who have lived at Rome must be aware that Mr. Story has been long resident there, and has had unusual opportunities of learning to know that strange half-dead city as it lives and moves. We can commend his work to all persons who have either been to Rome or think of going there."—*Spectator*.

CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193 PICCADILLY.

TRÜBNER AND CO.'S LIST OF NEW BOOKS IN THE PRESS, AND OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

SELECTIONS from the **LETTERS** of **CAROLINE FRANCES CORNWALLIS**, Author of "Pericles," "Small Books on Great Subjects," &c. Also some Unpublished Poems, Original and Translated. One Volume 8vo. [*Shortly.*]

HISTORY of the **SECT** of **MAHARAJAS**; or, **VALLABHACHARYAS** in **WESTERN INDIA**. By **KARSANDARS MULJEE**. With a Steel Plate. One Volume, 8vo. [*Shortly.*]

A TRANSLATION of **KRAFT UND STOFF**. By **DR. LOUIS BUCHNER**. Edited, by authority of the Author, by **J. FREDERICK COLLINGWOOD**, F.R.S.L., F.G.S. 8vo. [*Shortly.*]

ESSAYS on **LANGUAGE** and **LITERATURE**. By **THOS. WATTS**, of the British Museum. Reprinted, with Alterations and Additions, from the "Transactions" of the Philological Society, and elsewhere. One Volume, 8vo. [*In preparation.*]

REYNARD the FOX in **SOUTH AFRICA**; or, **Hottentot Fables and Tales**, chiefly Translated from Original Manuscripts in the Library of his Excellency Sir George Grey, K.C.B. By **W. H. J. BLEEK**, Ph.D. 8vo, 3s. 6d. [*Now ready.*]

THE LIFE and TIMES of **BERTRAND DU GUESCLIN**. A History of the Fourteenth Century. By **D. F. JAMISON**, of South Carolina. In Two Volumes, 8vo, printed with old-faced type, on toned laid paper. Portrait. 21s. [*Now ready.*]

JEREMY BENTHAM'S THEORY of **LEGISLATION**. From the French Version of **ETIENNE DUMONT**. In One Volume, 8vo, 7s. 6d. [*Now ready.*]

THE CITIES of the **PAST**. By **FRANCES POWER COBBE**. Fcap., pp. 216, 3s. 6d. [*Now ready.*]

BROKEN LIGHTS: an Inquiry into the Present Condition and Future Prospects of Religious Faith. By **FRANCES POWER COBBE**. In One Volume, crown 8vo, 6s.

THE EMPIRE in **INDIA**: **LETTERS** from **MADRAS** and other **PLACES**. By **MAJOR EVANS BELL**, Author of "The English in India," "Letters from Nagpore," &c. One Volume, crown 8vo, cloth, 8s. 6d. [*Now ready.*]

HISTORY of **SPANISH LITERATURE**. By **GEORGE TICKNOR**. Corrected and Enlarged Edition. Three Volumes, crown 8vo, each averaging 500 pp., bound in gilt cloth, price 24s.

THE COLLECTED WORKS of **THEODORE PARKER**, Minister of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Society at Boston, U.S. Containing his Theological, Poetical, and Critical Writings; Sermons, Speeches, and Addresses; and Literary Miscellanies. Edited by **FRANCES POWER COBBE**. In Twelve Volumes, 8vo.

The following Volumes are already published.

Vol. I. Containing Discourses on Matters pertaining to Religion; with Preface by the Editor, and a Portrait of Parker from a Medallion by Saulini. 380 pp., cloth, price 6s.

Vol. II. Containing Ten Sermons, and Prayers. 360 pp., cloth, price 6s.

Vol. III. Containing Discourses of Religion. 318 pp., cloth, price 6s.

Vol. IV. Containing Discourses of Politics. 312 pp., cloth, price 6s.

Vol. V. Containing Discourses of Slavery. Vol. I., 336 pp., cloth, price 6s.

Vol. VI. Containing Discourses of Slavery. Vol. II., 320 pp., cloth, 6s.

Vol. VII. Containing Discourses of Social Science. 320 pp., cloth, 6s.

WORKS by the **LATE HORACE HAYMAN WILSON**, M.A., F.R.S., Member of the Royal Asiatic Societies of London, Calcutta, and Paris, and of the Oriental Society of Germany, &c., and Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford.

Vols. I. and II. Essays and Lectures chiefly on the Religion of the Hindus. Collected and Edited by **DR. REINHOLD ROST**. Two Volumes, 8vo, pp. 393 and 416, cloth, price 21s.

Vols. III. IV. and V. Essays and Lectures chiefly connected with Oriental Literature. Collected and Edited by **DR. REINHOLD ROST**. Three Volumes, 8vo, cloth. Vols. I. and II., 24s.

Vols. VI., VII., VIII., and IX. Vishnu-Purana; or, System of Hindu Mythology and Tradition. Translated from the Original Sanskrit, and Illustrated by Notes, derived chiefly from other Puranas. Thoroughly Revised and Edited, with Notes, by **DR. FITZ-EDWARD HALL**. In Four Volumes, 8vo. Vol. I. 10s. 6d.

CHOIX D'OPUSCULES PHILOSOPHIQUES, HISTORIQUES, POLITIQUES, et LITTÉRAIRES de **SYLVAIN VAN DE WEVER**. Précédés d'Avant-propos de l'Éditeur. Première Série.

Table de Matières.

1. Le Roi Cobden.
2. Lettres sur les Anglais qui ont écrit en Français.
3. Discours sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie.
4. Moyen facile et économique d'être bienfaisant, proposé aux jeunes Gens, et suivi de Pensées diverses.
5. Lettre à M. Ernst Münch.

One Volume, crown 8vo, pp. 374, bound in the Roxburghe style, gilt top, price 10s. 6d.

TRÜBNER & CO., 60 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

Now ready,
THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

NEW SERIES.

No. L. APRIL 1864.

CONTENTS:

- I. The Basin of the Upper Nile and its Inhabitants.
- II. Strikes and Industrial Coöperation.
- III. The Abolition of Religious Tests.
- IV. The Prerogative of Pardon and the Punishment of Death.
- V. New Zealand.
- VI. Taine's History of English Literature.
- VII. The Philosophy of Roger Bacon.

Contemporary Literature:—1. Theology and Philosophy—2. Politics, Sociology, and Travels—3. Science—4. History and Biography—5. Belles-Lettres.

LONDON: TRÜBNER AND CO., 60 PATERNOSTER ROW.

Price 6s. Quarterly; Annual Subscription, prepaid, 21s. post-free.

THE HOME AND FOREIGN REVIEW.

No. VIII. APRIL 1864.

CONTENTS:

1. The Irish Exodus and Tenant Right.
2. The Schleswig-Holstein Movement in Germany.
3. Agriculture in France.
4. The Bank-Charter Act.
5. The Progress of Chemical Science.
6. Thackeray.
7. Indian Epic Poetry.
8. Asceticism among Mahometan Nations.
9. The Colonisation of Northumbria.
10. The Rise of the English Poor-Law.
11. Dr. Smith's Biblical Dictionary.
12. Conflicts with Rome.
13. Contemporary Literature.
14. Current Events.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
 AND 20 SOUTH-FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

Shortly will be published,
 AN ACCURATE REPORT OF AN UNEXAMPLED DISCUSSION,
 Wherein upwards of 250 Clergymen, Dissenting Ministers, and Laymen of various Denominations, express their views

**ON THE UNITY, THE DUALITY, AND THE TRINITY
 OF THE GODHEAD;**

With a variety of Digressions on Biblical Subjects.

LONDON: TRÜBNER AND CO., 60 PATERNOSTER ROW.

Recently published, post 8vo, cloth, price 4s. 6d.

UNITARIANISM IN THE PRESENT TIME:

Its more important Principles, its Tendencies, its Prospects.

By JOHN ORR.

"So scholarly and at the same time so profoundly religious a representation of the position, claims, and tendencies of Unitarianism, has not appeared for many a year."—*Inquirer.*

LONDON: WHITFIELD, GREEN, AND SON, 178 STRAND.

MANCHESTER: JOHNSON AND RAWSON, MARKET STREET.

Now ready, in One Volume, post 8vo, price 7s. cloth,

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF RELIGIOUS LIFE IN ENGLAND.

By SAMUEL ROWLES PATTISON.

CONTENTS:

Introduction—The First Planting—The Second Planting—The Normans—The Wycliffites—The Lollards—The Course of the Movement—Reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII.—Edward VI.—The Reign of Queen Mary—The Elizabethan Age—James I.; Charles I.—The Commonwealth—The Reign of Charles II., James II., and William III.—The Eighteenth Century: First Part—The Eighteenth Century: Second Part. Conclusion.

LONDON: JACKSON, WALFORD, & HODDER, 27 PATERNOSTER ROW.

THE REV. J. BALDWIN BROWN'S NEW WORK.

Now ready, in crown 8vo, price 5s. cloth antique, red edges,

THE DIVINE TREATMENT OF SIN.

By JAMES BALDWIN BROWN, B.A.

CONTENTS:

The Fall considered as a Development.
The Burden of Existence.
The Pressure of the Burden on God.
Abounding Sin; Over-abounding Grace.
The Penitent's Need.

The Penitent's Gospel.
She loved much: she had much forgiven.
The Sin that hath never Forgiveness.
On restoring a Sinner.
And yet there is Room.

By the same Author.

Second Edition, in crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d. cloth,

THE DIVINE LIFE IN MAN.

FOURTEEN DISCOURSES.

LONDON: JACKSON, WALFORD, & HODDER, 27 PATERNOSTER ROW.

Just published, in One Volume, crown 8vo, price 7s. cloth.

MODERN FRANCE; ITS JOURNALISM, LITERATURE, AND SOCIETY.

By A. V. KIRWAN, Esq., BARRISTER-AT-LAW;

Author of the Article "France" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica;" "Ports, Arsenals, and Dockyards of France;" "The Army and Garrisons of France," &c.

Journalism in France—The Press, Literature, and Society of France—The Bourse of Paris and its Speculators—Paris and its Industry—Military System of France—Portraits of French Celebrities—Napoleonism.

"A comprehensive, liberal conception of the condition of France, social, literary, and political."—*Daily News*.

"Mr. Kirwan writes pithily about things which he has seen with his own eyes during many years' residence in France, and which he has had special opportunities of studying to advantage."—*Examiner*.

"An important exposition of the history of our neighbours, rivals, and allies, by a painstaking and able writer, who shows in every part of his work an intimate knowledge of his subject. Among the many valuable elucidations contained in 'Modern France,' all the passages which relate to the fluctuations in the liberty of the French press deserve particular notice. No Englishman has ever before traced the history of political literature in that country with so clear and firm a hand. But altogether the book is full of interest; while its style and manner are most masterly."—*Court Journal*.

"With all the authority of a man who knows France well, and has known it long, he describes the evils of the present system of government, and the terrible effects that spring from those evils."—*Reader*.

"One half of the volume is devoted to a history of 'Journalism in France;' and it is probable that a more succinct, yet full and accurate, narrative of the rise of this important branch of literature, from the first *Mercure Français* in 1605 to its fall and intellectual collapse under the Second Empire, is nowhere to be found."—*Dublin Evening Mail*.

LONDON: JACKSON, WALFORD, & HODDER, 27 PATERNOSTER ROW.

**BREAKFAST CRUETS, 20s.**

USUALLY CHARGED 35s.

Handsome Four-Glass Cruet Frame	20s.
Chased Vine Pattern Cake Basket	30s.
Chased Bread Basket, to match	40s.
Handsome Engraved Salver, or 6-inch	15s.
Waiter, for Handing Wine, 7-inch	18s.
A very suitable for Presents, 8-inch	21s.
Handsome Fish Carver, in Case	16s.
12 Pairs Ivory Handled Dessert Knives and Forks	50s.
12 Pairs Pearl Handled ditto ditto	80s.

The above prices will give some idea of the stock. This Establishment is the oldest of its class in London, having been well known as the Golden Ball of Bowyer Row (now Ludgate Street), in the reign of Elizabeth; it is hoped this will be a guarantee of the quality of its manufactures. ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE GRATIS.

Thomas West, 18, Ludgate Street, London. Manufactory, Victoria Works.

WEST'S PATENT ELECTRO PLATE (AMALGAMATED SILVER)

Is the only Article equal to Silver.

ELECTRO-PLATED SPOONS & FORKS, FULL SIZE.

Best quality.	Fiddle Pattern.	Thread Pattern.	King's Pattern.	Lily Pattern.
12 Table Forks	£1 16 0	£2 8 0	£3 0 0	£3 10 0
12 Table Spoons	1 16 0	2 8 0	3 0 0	3 10 0
12 Dessert Forks	1 7 0	1 15 0	2 2 0	2 10 0
12 Dessert Spoons	1 7 0	1 15 0	2 2 0	2 10 0
12 Tea Spoons	0 16 0	1 4 0	1 7 0	1 16 0
2 Sauce Ladles	0 8 0	0 8 0	0 10 6	0 13 0
1 Gravy Spoon	0 7 0	0 10 6	0 11 0	0 13 0
4 Salt Spoons (gilt)	0 6 8	0 10 0	0 12 0	0 14 0
1 Mustard Spoon, do.	0 1 8	0 2 6	0 3 0	0 3 0
1 Pair Sugar Tongs	0 3 6	0 4 6	0 5 0	0 7 0
1 Pair Fish Carvers	1 0 0	1 7 6	1 12 0	1 18 0
1 Butter Knife	0 3 0	0 5 0	0 6 0	0 7 0
1 Soup Ladle	0 12 0	0 16 0	0 17 6	0 19 0
6 Egg Spoons (gilt)	0 10 0	0 15 0	0 18 0	1 10 0

Complete Service £10 12 10 14 9 6 17 6 0 20 12 0

Any Article sold separately at the same prices.

One Set of Four Corner Dishes (forming 8 Dishes), £8; one Set of Four Dish Covers—viz., one 20-inch, one 18-inch, and two 14-inch—£9 18s.; Cruet Frame, 4-Glass, 20s.; Full size Tea and Coffee Service, £9 10s. A Costly Book of Engravings, with prices attached, sent per post gratis. Spoons and Forks of equal quality usually charged one-third more.

IMPORTANT



ANNOUNCEMENT.

METALLIC PEN MAKER TO THE QUEEN,

BY ROYAL COMMAND.

JOSEPH GILLOTT

Begs most respectfully to inform the Commercial World, Scholastic Institutions, and the Public generally, that, by a novel application of his unrivalled Machinery for making Steel Pens, and in accordance with the scientific spirit of the times, he has introduced a NEW SERIES of his useful productions, which, for EXCELLENCE OF TEMPER, QUALITY OF MATERIAL, and, above all, CHEAPNESS IN PRICE, he believes will insure universal approbation, and defy competition.

Each Pen bears the impress of his name as a guarantee of quality; and they are put up in the usual style of boxes, containing one gross each, with label outside, and the facsimile of his signature.

At the request of persons extensively engaged in tuition, J. G. has introduced his

WARRANTED SCHOOL AND PUBLIC PENS,

which are especially adapted to their use, being of different degrees of flexibility, and with fine, medium, and broad points, suitable for the various kinds of Writing taught in Schools.

Sold Retail by all Stationers, Booksellers, and other respectable Dealers in Steel Pens.—Merchants and Wholesale Dealers can be supplied at the Works, Graham Street; 96 New Street, Birmingham;

91 JOHN STREET, NEW YORK; AND AT 37 GRACECHURCH STREET, LONDON.

THE NATIONAL REVIEW.

APRIL 1864.

ART. I.—THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN.

Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis. Scripsit Jo. Godofr. Eichhorn. 2 vols. Gottingæ, 1791.

A general History of the Christian Church from her Birth to her final Triumphant State in Heaven: chiefly deduced from the Apocalypse of St. John the Apostle and Evangelist. By Signor Pastorini. Fifth edition. 1812.

Apocalypsis Græce. Perpetua annotatione illustrata a Joanne Henrico Heinrichs. Gottingæ, 1818, 1821.

Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis exegeticus et criticus. Auctore Georgio Henrico Augusto Ewald, Professore. Lipsiæ, 1828.

Die Johanneischen Schriften übersetzt und erklärt. Von Heinrich Ewald. Zweiter Band: Johannes' Apokalypse. Göttingen, 1862.

Die Offenbarung Johannis vollständig erklärt. Von Dr. Th. F. Jakob Züllig. Stuttgart, 1834, 1840.

A Commentary on the Apocalypse. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. 2 vols. London, 1845.

Kurze Erklärung der Offenbarung Johannis. Von Dr. W. M. L. De Wette. Leipzig, 1848.

Die Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes für solche die in der Schrift forschen erläutert. Von E. W. Hengstenberg. 2 vols. 1849-51.

Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes, oder allgemeine Untersuchungen über die Apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannes insbesondere. Von Dr. Friedrich Lücke. Zweyte Auflage. Bonn, 1852.

Die Offenbarung Johannis erklärt. Von J. H. A. Ebrard. 1853.

Thoughts on the Apocalypse. By Benjamin Wills Newton. 1853.

Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis, u.s.w. Von Carl August Auberlen. Basel, 1854.

The Apocalypse fulfilled in the Consummation of the Mosaic Economy and the Coming of the Son of Man. By Rev. P. S. Desprez, B.D. Second edition. 1855.

The Apocalypse of St. John. A new translation, metrically arranged, with Scripture illustrations. By John H. Godwin. 1856.

Christian Prophecy; or, Expository Lectures on the Revelation to the Apostle John. By S. T. Porter. 1858.

Kritisches exegetisches Handbuch über die Offenbarung Johannis. Von Dr. Friedrich Düsterdieck. Göttingen, 1859.

The Revelation of John its own Interpreter in virtue of the double version in which it is delivered. By John Cochran. 1860.

Lectures on the Book of Revelation. By William Kelly. 1861.

Lectures on the Apocalypse, or Book of Revelation by St. John the Divine. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M.A. 1861.

The Revelation of Jesus Christ by John. Expounded by Francis Bodfield Hooper. 2 vols. 1861.

Die Offenbarung Johannis übersetzt und kurz erklärt für die Gemeinde. Von Dr. C. E. Luthardt. 1861.

Die Offenbarung Johannis aus dem Zusammenhange der messianischen Reichsgeschichte nach Analogie der Schrift für Freunde der christlichen Weissagungen ausgelegt. Von J. Ph. Sabel. 1861.

Commentar zur Offenbarung Johannis. Von Dr. Gustav Volkmar. Zürich, 1862.

Dr. Friedrich Bleek's Vorlesungen über die Apokalypse. Herausgegeben von Licentiat Hossbach. 1862.

Horæ Apocalypticæ; or, a Commentary on the Apocalypse, critical and historical; including also an Examination of the chief Prophecies of Daniel. Illustrated by an Apocalyptic Chart, and engravings from medals and other extant monuments of antiquity. With Appendices, &c. By Rev. E. B. Elliott, A.M. Fifth edition, in 4 vols. 1862.

"I CANNOT pretend to explain the book: I do not understand it; and in the things which concern so sublime and awful a subject, I dare not, as my predecessors, indulge in conjectures. I have read elaborate works on the subject, and each seemed right till another was examined. I am satisfied that no certain mode of interpreting the prophecies of this book has yet been found out, and I will not add another monument to the littleness or folly of the human mind by endeavouring to strike out a new course. I repeat it, I do not understand the book; and I am satisfied that not one who has written on the subject knows any thing more of it than myself." Thus speaks an English com-

mentator, with a singular mixture of vanity and humility. Had he been a man of real learning and perspicacity, those who attempted since his day to expound the book of Revelation, had reason to charge themselves with presumption. But the saying of the egotistical preacher carries nothing with it sufficient to deter the student of Scripture from seeking to know the purport of the apocalyptic work which closes the canonical writings. Some will add the characteristic saying of Dr. South, that the book "either finds a man mad, or makes him so," to help the supposed hopelessness of inquiry in the same direction; and Scaliger's remark about Calvin showing his wisdom in not writing on the Apocalypse. Though hosts of authors have commented on the prophetic pages of John with no other result than disappointment, all are not liable to the charge of folly. Yet it is a melancholy spectacle to behold the heaps of rubbish which the industry of men, more daring than wise, has accumulated for centuries. Vanity of vanities is their appropriate motto. Surely God has given his intelligent creatures better powers of mind than are exemplified in the wild fancies which they have identified with the general meaning of the Apocalyptic symbols. But there is no reason for despair in the attempt to decipher this peculiar part of divine revelation; for although it has been darkened by perverted ingenuity, it has also been cleared up by the learned researches of a few. The wise and sober interpreter will learn by careful study from the pages of the book itself, as well as from authors of acknowledged ability, that the apostolic seer had other ideas than the monstrosities so often assigned to him; and that the Spirit of God influences the mind in accordance with its ordinary operations and the times to which it belongs. It is our desire in the present paper to discuss as briefly as possible the leading questions belonging to the book, so that readers may have a general view of its origin, aim, and meaning. For this purpose it will be better not to cumber the pages with multitudinous opinions, or even to refute the plausible sentiments of expositors whose views are entitled to attention. There is no allowable space for polemics, were it desirable to indulge in them. Different modes of interpretation must be unnoticed, if we would not do injustice to our own.

To begin with *authorship*. The prevailing opinion has always been that John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee, wrote the book before us. In favour of this view both external and internal evidence unite to speak. In relation to the former, some begin the series of witnesses with Polycarp, the Apostle's disciple, as Hengstenberg does. In the epistle to the Philippians he writes: "Let us therefore so serve him with fear and

all reverence as he himself hath commanded, and as the apostles who have preached the Gospel unto us, and *the prophets who have foretold the coming of our Lord*; being zealous of what is good," &c. The Berlin critic supposes that the prophets are not personally different from the apostles; the apostle John in the Apocalypse being their representative. We believe that the Old Testament prophets are spoken of.

The most ancient testimony in favour of the authenticity of the Apocalypse comes to us indirectly. Two Cappadocian bishops belonging to the latter part of the fourth century, or to the fifth, Andreas and Arethas, relate that Papias knew the Apocalypse, and looked upon it as an inspired book; which was then tantamount to the belief of its apostolic origin. It is true that Papias does not speak of it as the work of John the apostle, in express terms; but it is a fair inference that his regarding it as of *divine authority* and *credible*, comports best with the idea of its being written by none other. We may admit with Eusebius that Papias was not the hearer of John the apostle, but of John the presbyter,—especially as he himself intimates thus much,—and at the same time cite him as a good witness for the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse. It has seemed singular that Eusebius omits the testimony of this early writer. But his silence is capable of an easy explanation. The historian was unfavourable to Papias because of the millennarian views he entertained; and calls him weak-minded on that account. The extravagant expectations of John the presbyter's hearer and his day were probably derived from oral tradition in the view of Eusebius; or if they were not, Dionysius of Alexandria had influenced the mind of the historian, leading it to doubt the authenticity of the book. One thing is clear, that Eusebius would not have omitted all mention of Papias in relation to the point, if the latter had expressed himself hesitatingly on it. This he did not; for he belonged to a country where he had good opportunities of knowing the origin of the Apocalypse, as well as the presbyter John himself to whom Dionysius ascribes it. The testimony of Melito, bishop of Sardis, is on the same side with Papias's. Eusebius states that he wrote a book "about the devil and the Apocalypse of John." The fact that the bishop of Sardis, one of the cities to which an epistle is addressed in the introductory part of Revelation, wrote upon the book, goes far to prove its apostolicity.

Justin Martyr is the earliest writer who expressly attributes the book to John the apostle at Ephesus. It is true that Rettig has tried to impugn the authenticity of the passage in Justin; but without effect, as Lücke and Schott have ably proved. And Eusebius states, that Justin wrote his Dialogue or Dis-

putation with Trypho, in which the place alluding to the Apocalypse occurs, at Ephesus, the first city of the seven to which an epistle was addressed by the author (Rev. i. 11; ii. 1). Surely the worthy father must have known the authorship well by historical tradition. In the circle within which he lived and acted, Justin knew of none other than the apostle as the author. We conclude, therefore, that before the middle of the second century, the opinion that John the presbyter was the writer, had not originated. There is no reason for thinking that Justin rested on *exegetical* grounds; neither time nor place agrees with the hypothesis. The earliest Christian period relied more upon persons than writings for the support of their faith. Not long after Justin, and in the same century, Apollonius, presbyter at Ephesus, drew proofs from the Apocalypse even against the Montanists, as Eusebius states. The context of the passage in which the historian speaks of him leaves no room for doubt that Apollonius used the book as the production of John the apostle. Irenæus is also a witness in favour of the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. He appeals besides to ancient Mss. for the genuineness of the number 666, as well as to persons who had seen the apostle John. Great weight belongs to this testimony, because Irenæus must have learned the truth about the writer in proconsular Asia, before he went to Gaul. The seven churches would carefully preserve the document addressed to themselves. We do not see that the witness of Irenæus is weakened by the fact that he was mistaken in the *date* of the book; or because he received superstitious and absurd accounts of John from the presbyters who professed to have seen him. It is probable that the father drew the late date he assigns to the Apocalypse from a false interpretation of itself, or from vague report. And as to the superstitious opinions of John received from the elders, they have nothing to do with the composition of a work like the present, because they were deduced from the interpretation of places in the Old Testament. The epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne given by Eusebius also presupposes the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse; so that from Asia Minor to Gaul the book is well attested as John's in the second century.

Tertullian uses it as an apostolic one, showing that Africa participated in the historical tradition which prevailed in other countries. But the want of one witness during the second century appears suspicious at first sight, viz. the Syriac translation of the New Testament. The Apocalypse is absent from the Peshito. Nor did this old version admit the book afterwards; though scholars in the Syrian church subsequently put it on a level with the other parts of the New Testament, and another

Syriac translation of the Apocalypse was made which was never thought to be equal in authority to what the Peshito would have been considered, had the latter existed. It is true that Hug and others suppose that the Peshito had the book at first; but this is incorrect. How, then, is the exclusion of the Apocalypse from this very ancient version to be accounted for? Perhaps by this, that at the commencement of the second century when the Peshito was made, the Apocalypse had not found its way to Edessa, the birthplace of the version. It is certain that Theophilus of Antioch, at the end of the same century, accepted the book as apostolic. In the second century also the Alogi ascribed the Apocalypse, as well as the other writings of John, to Cerinthus. Caius of Rome, from opposition to Montanism, ventured to make the same statement; as a fragment of Proclus's, preserved by Eusebius, asserts: "But Cerinthus, by means of revelations which he pretended were written by a great apostle, falsely introduces wonderful things to us, as if they were showed him by angels," &c.* This passage has given rise to discussion, some affirming that the revelations spoken of do not mean the present Apocalypse, but *forged revelations* as a counterpart to it. We agree with Lücke, in opposition to Paulus and Hug, in referring it to the Apocalypse, not to fictitious revelations.

Marion and his followers excluded the book from their canon, and therefore rejected its apostolic authorship. This arose from their peculiar tenets, and is of no weight as evidence.

When we pass to the third century, the evidence for the apostolic authority of the book is most favourable. Clement of Alexandria ascribed it to John; as did also Origen, notwithstanding his opposition to millenarianism. Cyprian, Lactantius, and Methodius were of the same opinion. And Hippolytus of Ostia probably wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse directed against the Montanists. But critical doubts began with Dionysius of Alexandria, owing, as it would seem, to doctrinal disputes with the millenarian adherents of Nepos. This father ascribed the work to John the presbyter, not to the apostle. He bases his opinion on internal grounds,—on style, language, and characteristic peculiarities,—arguing from the differences of the fourth gospel and first epistle general of John, that the same person could not have written the Apocalypse also. His reasoning has a subjective value merely; and is valid on the assumption that the gospel and first epistle proceeded from the apostle. But it has no worth as an independent histo-

* Ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήριθος ὁ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένους ψευδόμενος ἐπείσάγει, κ.τ.λ. *H. E.* iii. 28.

rical testimony, because it contradicts the current of ecclesiastical tradition. When Dionysius appeals to *some* of his predecessors who utterly rejected the book, and thought that it should be excluded from the canon, he could only have alluded to the few who looked upon the production as the work of Cerinthus; to Caius, the Alogi, and other Antimontanists.

In the fourth century, Eusebius the historian seems undecided about retaining or rejecting the Apocalypse. His opposition to millennarianism inclined him to the latter course, not less than the critical doubts of Dionysius. On the other hand, a constant and firm tradition was arrayed on behalf of the apostolicity. The historian conjectures, with Dionysius, that the writer may be John the presbyter; but affirms that he will not refuse to put it among the *ὁμολογούμενα*, if cause for doing so should appear (*εἴγε φανεῖν*). This wavering policy tells unfavourably on behalf of his honesty as a historian; since it is not improbable that he could have cited older witnesses for the apostolic authority of the book, had he been so disposed.

It is scarcely necessary to follow the series of external testimonies farther than Eusebius. Later witnesses belong to the history of the canon, rather than to criticism. Enough has been given to prove that the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse is as well attested as that of any other book in the New Testament. How can it be proved that Paul wrote the epistle to the Galatians, for example, on the basis of external evidence, if it be denied that John the apostle wrote the closing book of the canon? With the limited stock of early ecclesiastical literature that survives the wreck of time, we should despair of proving the authenticity of any New Testament book by the help of ancient witnesses, if that of the Apocalypse be rejected.

Let it not be urged that the patristic tradition was not unanimous, but divided in character, and that little weight should be attached to the testimonies of the fathers, discordant as they frequently are on topics that come under their notice. The historical tradition relative to the Apocalypse seems to have been interrupted by doctrinal views merely. Had no Montanism or millennarianism appeared in the earliest times, we should have heard of no voice raised against John's authorship. We do not deny that the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries occasionally adopted vague traditions, without inquiring whether they rested on a good foundation; and that they were generally incapable of critical investigation, if not disinclined to it; or that they often followed their immediate predecessors, contented to glide down the ecclesiastical stream without examining the ground of their belief. There were noble exceptions; and it is an undoubted fact, that from the middle of the

second century several of the most distinguished fathers connected with the church in Asia Minor, who had excellent opportunities of knowing the truth of the prevailing tradition there, received the work as an authentic document of the apostle John. Even Clement and Origen, whose doctrinal standpoint hardly agreed with the book, did not doubt its apostolicity. The basis of the tradition cannot be explained away without doing violence to the principles of historical evidence.

We should not have drawn out the argument to such extent had not the apostolicity of the book been doubted or denied by some of the ablest scholars in Germany. At the time of the Reformation, Erasmus intimated his doubts of it, thinking it strange that one writing revelations should repeat his name so carefully, *I John, I John*, as if he were drawing up a bond, not a book; which is contrary both to the custom of other apostles, and especially his own; for in the gospel he speaks more modestly, and never gives his name. When Paul is forced to speak of his visions, he explains the thing in the person of another. Erasmus goes on to say, that in the Greek copies he had seen, the title was, of *John the divine*, not *John the evangelist*; and that the language is not a little different from that of the gospel and first epistle.*

Luther speaks more decidedly against the apostle's authorship: "More than one thing presents itself in this book as a reason why I hold it to be neither apostolic nor prophetic. First and most of all, that the apostles do not concern themselves with visions but with prophecy in clear, plain words, as Peter, Paul, and Christ in the gospel do; for it belongs to the apostolic office clearly and without image or vision to speak about Christ and his work. Moreover, there is no prophet in the Old Testament, not to speak of the New, who is occupied with visions throughout; so that I almost imagine to myself a fourth book of Esdras before me, and certainly can find no reason for believing that it was set forth by the Holy Spirit. Besides, it seems to me far too arrogant in him to enjoin it upon his readers to regard his own as of more importance than any other sacred book, and to threaten that if any one shall take aught away from it, God will take away from his part in the book of life. Moreover, even were it a blessed thing to believe what is contained in it, no man knows what that is. The book is believed in (and is really just the same to us) as though we had it not, and many nobler books exist for us to believe in. . . . But let every man think of it as his spirit prompts him. My spirit cannot adapt itself to the production; and this is reason enough for me that I should not highly esteem it, that Christ is neither

* Annotationes in Apocalypsin Joannis, Novum Testamentum, ed. 1, p. 625.

taught nor perceived in it; which is the great business of an apostle.* Though he used milder language afterwards, he never retracted his doubts.

Zwingle would not accept passages in proof from the Apocalypse, "because it is not a biblical book," i.e. a canonical one. Eccolampadius and Bucer appear to have had the same opinion. Carlstadt shared their doubts. Eder and Semler also denied the apostolicity; but the latter changed his opinion and admitted it. Michaelis assigned better reasons for the negative view. In the same path followed Heinrichs, Bretschneider, Bleek, De Wette, Ewald, Lücke, Schott, Hitzig, Credner, Reuss, Neander, and Düsterdieck. Respectable names are found on the other side; but the arguments of Lücke, Ewald, Bleek, De Wette, and Düsterdieck are best stated. Ewald and Bleek, the latest who have written on the subject, deserve respect for their learning, honesty, and integrity. No critical opinion of theirs ought to be summarily dismissed. In this country, indeed, the book has been uniformly assigned to the apostle; but a conservative tendency in general has been more influential in the result than thorough investigation; as appears from the fact that the fourth gospel and first general epistle of John have also been generally attributed to the apostle. English theologians do not yet see with De Wette, that if the apostle wrote the Apocalypse, he did not write the fourth gospel; or if he wrote the latter, that he could not have been the author of the former. We believe, however, that this proposition is beginning to be acknowledged as possible, or rather as probable, even in England. The more it is considered, it will appear more reasonable.

Does internal evidence coincide with the external as regards authorship? In four places John calls himself the author (i. 1, 4, 9; xxii. 8); sometimes without a predicate, at other times with the phrase *servant of Jesus Christ*, or *your brother and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ*, in relation to his readers; while in xxii. 9 he is styled by the angel a *fellow-servant* and *brother of the prophets*. He presents himself in the character of a man who was well known to the Christian churches of proconsular Asia—an influential personage in whose divine mission they could have no reason to doubt. The predicates he attributes to himself show a consciousness of his dignity, yet a modesty withal arising from a sense of the unity subsisting among true Christians. Though he does not call himself *an apostle*, he is commanded to write what he had seen, and to *send* it to the seven churches (i. 11). He is *the prophet* of the Messiah, not his *apostle*, in this instance.

* Preface to the Revelation, 1522.

There was no apparent necessity for the writer to designate himself *an apostle*, because the epithets accompanying the name John were sufficient to indicate his person. He was the immediate witness of the Messiah, the announcer of the revelations of God, the prophet of the New Covenant. Like Daniel, he speaks of himself, *I John*. He treats of the apostolic time, when Jewish ideas prevailed, and the expectation of Messiah was fresh in the general mind. When he wrote, several apostles were living, and probably near the sphere in which John himself acted. No other man could then lay claim to the position and privilege which the writer of the book asserts. Contemporary apostles would have frowned upon the work: John himself would have disowned it. A work bearing his name, and composed about thirty years before his death, would have certainly called forth a contradiction, because he knew that it would be taken for his; and such contradiction would have reached us from the circle of his disciples through Irenæus. The later assertions of its non-apostolic authorship arose from doctrinal interests. None of them, as far as we can judge, sprung from historical tradition.

Two passages have been adduced as unfavourable to the apostolic authorship, viz. xviii. 20 and xxi. 14. In the former, the writer speaks of the saints and apostles and prophets rejoicing over the downfall of Babylon; in the latter, of the names of the twelve apostles being inscribed upon the foundations of the walls of the New Jerusalem. Now it is argued that the apostle would not speak so if he himself were living. But in the context of xviii. 20 the seer had transferred himself from the future into the past and present, anticipating the judgment upon Babylon. Taken strictly, the language would imply that no believer whatever was upon earth at the time; which proves too much. As to xxi. 14, the language is not very different from that of Paul in Ephes. ii. 20, where he affirms that the Christian church is built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, not excluding himself; nor from that in 1 Cor. iii. 10, where he speaks of himself as a wise master-builder laying the foundation of the church at Corinth. Why, then, should John not speak of himself as one of the foundations? Is it inconsistent with modesty to do so? If so, did not the sons of Zebedee covet the two highest places in the kingdom of Christ, as we read in Matthew xx. 20? We need not wonder at the number twelve being employed, rather than thirteen, including St. Paul. The types and symbols of the book exclude the idea of minute exactness. Twelve is a number often used by the writer; the twelve tribes of Israel, twelve thousand sealed ones, &c.; and Matthew himself, in speaking of the thrones allotted

to the apostles, regards them as twelve, without relation to St. Paul whom he must have known. Nothing more is needed than a comparison of Paul's own language in the epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians to show that he never lost the feeling of conscious dignity implied in the apostolic office; though he retained his Christian humility. And surely the consciousness of a like dignity was not less among the Palestinian apostles, as we may infer from 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11, &c. Thus nothing in either passage is fitted to shake our belief in the apostolicity of the work.

Do the contents of the book agree with the assumption of its proceeding from an apostolic man; or do they present phenomena inconsistent with the known character of John and the time when he wrote? To answer this question we must take a general survey of the contents. These are certainly apostolic, chiefly the *eschatology* (doctrine of the last things) of the book, which is its prominent feature. When we survey the New Testament, it is easy to observe the deep impression which the idea of their Lord's speedy coming had made upon the minds of the apostles. He was to appear in the clouds of heaven with great power and glory, like the Messiah in Daniel, whom the Jews expected. The near approach of Christ's advent was the enlivening and consolatory motive held out in all the apostolic epistles. It was ever present to the mind of St. Paul, who proclaims *Maran-atha*, speaks of his coming with all his saints, of his descending from heaven with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, believes that *the day of the Lord*—which is equivalent to *the day of Jesus Christ, that day, the day of redemption*—is at hand; and that he himself should live to see it. Then should the saints be judges of the world, and even of angels. Because of the nearness of *this day* the apostle exhorts his readers to watchfulness. Now St. Paul assures us that he received nothing from the other apostles, but that all his Christian ideas came from immediate revelation; which shows that the eschatological element in Matthew and the Apocalypse was an essential part of Christianity. Nor is it confined to Paul's epistles. We find it in the letter to the Hebrews. Peter teaches the same thing, saying, "the end of all things is at hand." The epistles of John express it also. The forerunners of the great Antichrist had already come. James recommends patience unto the coming of the Lord, which he affirms to be near. And Jude proves, from the existence of mockers, that it is the last time. The description of Christ's advent, thus hoped for and expected by all the New Testament writers, is most developed in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew's gospel; where the ideas of retribution appear in a solemn judi-

cial process preceded by great distress; and the Messiah reveals himself in splendour, ushering in a new dispensation of time, in which the faithful should be recompensed for present sufferings. Such ideas are common to it and the Apocalypse. The main difference between the Revelation and other apostolic writings in regard to the expected coming of the Lord consists in the wide interval which John puts between the manifestation of Messiah and the end of the world—the space of a thousand years; while they place the time of the Messianic kingdom very near the process of final judgment.

In like manner, the *Christology* of the Apocalypse contains genuine apostolic elements. The idea of Jesus the Messiah is, that he existed before the world; that he is the highest spirit; that by virtue of his Messianic nature he is, like to Jehovah, from the beginning; that he is the Alpha and Omega; yet that he is a created spirit, having received his Messiah-nature from the Father. Hence he is termed “the beginning of the creation of God” (iii. 14); and the expression “Son of God” (ii. 18) refers merely to the divine sovereignty bestowed upon him by the Father, according to Psalm ii. 8. Divine qualities and powers are assigned to Jesus, as far as the Messiah appeared in him. Accordingly, he sits upon the same throne with his Father; and the Jehovah-name is his *new* name. The spiritual and potential perfections he possesses were bestowed upon him as a reward for his faithful and victorious career. He is the organ of communication between God and His people; and therefore he is the “word of God,” not “God the word,” as in John i. 1. When he has accomplished the purposes for which the government of the world was given into his hands, he will resign the power and kingdom into the hands of the Father, and reign under him (xi. 15-17). This agrees with the Pauline Christology in the main; though it is here unfolded in a more Jewish form than it is in St. Paul’s epistles.

The conception of Antichrist in the Apocalypse also manifests the apostolic time. The name of this power, which became stereotyped from the beginning of the second century, does not appear in the book. The idea is found in its concrete form, but the appellation is wanting. The Antichrist of the Revelation is a worldly prince, in whom the powers of evil are concentrated. Bearing the symbolical name of the beast, he is conceived of as a definite historical character; and other hostile beast-forms are latent in him. So also in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, Antichrist has the same concrete form, and receives general appellations, such as the *man of sin*, the *son of perdition*, &c. It is in John’s epistles that we first meet with the name *Antichrist*. The idea of the great enemy of Christ in the Apo-

calypse is in the same stage of development as it is in the second epistle to the Thessalonians.

Need we add that the *pneumatology* of the Revelation agrees with all that we find in the apostolic writings; and that it contains no later ideas on the subject than the Pauline ones? The power of the devil in relation to the kingdom of Christ is presented under the same aspect in the Apocalypse as in the Epistles of Paul. Though the arch-enemy of man was vanquished by Christ at his first advent, he was not for ever subdued. He is still active; and the contest with him continues till the second advent of the Redeemer. This prince of darkness has legions of spirits associated with himself; and the Messiah by whom he is subdued must therefore be the *King of kings* and *Lord of lords*; or, as it is expressed by Paul, *the head of all principality and power*. Thus the book before us contains no ideas of the spiritual world additional to the Pauline.

As far as the individuality of John is reflected in the New Testament and tradition, it is in harmony with the contents of the Apocalypse. The sons of Zebedee were fiery, zealous, impetuous spirits, whose feelings readily led them to excess or revenge. They wished to call down fire from heaven to consume the inhabitants of a Samaritan village; and begged for the foremost places in the kingdom of heaven. John forbade one who presumed to cast out devils in the name of Jesus. He was a Boanerges or son of thunder, with a decided individuality, and an ardent disposition that needed checks. As far as he appears in the Acts and Pauline epistles, he is somewhat narrow and Judaic, unemancipated from national prepossessions. Accordingly, the Quartodecimans appealed to the Jewish practice of the apostle John; while Polycrates of Ephesus states that he was a priest, and wore the sacerdotal plate. This agrees with the priestly character of the seven epistles; and if he were of a priestly family, as is not improbable, he might appropriate the insignia of priestly dignity, representing himself as one initiated into the mysteries of Jesus. Tradition in Asia Minor represented him as a mediator between Christ and the Church. He had the surname of Παρθένος, *the virgin* (comp. Revelation xiv. 4), and appeared as an ascetic who received divine communications. Continuing, as he did for a while, in Jerusalem, we are unable to tell with what subject his mind was chiefly occupied. Perhaps he was tracing out in the Scriptures the signs of the returning Messiah, and looking for the great future at hand. Probably the dissolution of the bond existing between the Jews and Jewish Christians there, broken as it was by the latter, caused him to feel that the place was unfit for his presence. With the enemies of Christ, as he must

have considered the unbelieving Jews, he could have no more communion; they were rejected. The very metropolis they prided in, with its ancestral renown, was to be overthrown, and a *new kingdom of Israel* brought down to earth. Hence it was time to depart.

After he had removed to Asia Minor, he is depicted as indignantly contending against erroneous teachers, both of the Jewish and Gentile parties. Irenæus states from Polycarp that the apostle, going into a bath on one occasion, discovered Cerinthus there; and leaping out of it, hastened away, saying he was afraid lest the building should fall on him and crush him along with the heretic. Very faithfully are these traits of character reflected in the book before us, whose prevailing tone is that of an impassioned spirit, full of rage against the despisers of God and his anointed One, with images of dragons, murder, blood and fire, vials of wrath. The souls of the martyrs invoke vengeance on their persecutors; and all heaven is called upon to rejoice over the downfall of Babylon the great.

We have represented the apostle as retaining some of his old Judaic prepossessions,—as one whose Christianity was narrowed by the national type of thought. This opinion is justified by the Apocalypse itself, where *the elders*, who are always numbered in relation to the *twelve tribes*, appear as a selected body representing the faithful church of God on earth, and sit upon thrones immediately surrounding that of God, as if they were assessors participating in judicial functions. They are the elect, the first-fruits to God and the Lamb (vii. 4, 5; xii. 1; xxi. 12). On the other hand, the saved of the heathen, though a great multitude, are farther from the Almighty's throne, behind and distinguished from the former (vii. 4, 13; xiv. 1, &c.; xxi. 12, &c.). The latter are the crowd,—an appendix, as it were, to the chosen representatives of the true people of God. It is true that the 144,000 presented to view in vii. 1-9; xiv. 1-5; xv. 2-4, may be regarded as the whole multitude of Christians collected out of all nations and peoples; yet even there the very universalism of the apocalypticist has a Judaising character, since the entire number of believers is classified according to the old division of the twelve tribes, and every Christian is put into one tribe or another. The title to the kingdom of God is bound up with such classification. The heathen are enrolled among the twelve tribes when they become Christian. Thus their formulising proves the Judaising view of the apostle. Yet it must not be supposed that the apostle was a narrow-minded Jew, of the kind which Schwegler has depicted. He was emphatically a Christian. Primitive Christianity stood upon a Jewish basis, being developed out of Judaism. Hence

the victory of Christianity assumes in the Apocalypse the external form of a kingdom coextensive with the world itself; but with Christ reigning in the royal city of Jerusalem purified and transformed; no longer the old apostate Jerusalem which crucified the Lord, and is called Sodom and Egypt on that account. While we see the partiality with which the Jews in particular are called and converted, and the national Judaism of the twelve tribes reappearing in the new Jerusalem in elevated splendour and glory, yet the apocalypticist regards *Christians* as the only orthodox Jews, having the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus. He looks upon them as an elect Jewish church, admitting the heathen to their communion. The nationality of the apostle had assumed a Christian type. He had fairly abandoned empirical Judaism, by teaching that the Judaism which embraced Christ was *the only genuine* one. This accounts for the fact that he describes the cause of Christ triumphing over Judaism; and exalts the person of that Redeemer whom the Jews crucified. As soon as unity ceased to exist between the Jews who believed in Christ and such as still adhered to the old religion, the former must have looked upon the latter no longer as brethren but enemies; and John would repair to Asia Minor, the theatre of Paul's activity, which he impressed in a high degree with his own individuality. There he lived and laboured in the spirit of a Christian Judaism, so to speak, which differed from Paul's in the method of its development and limitations more than the essential result. Not until the freer Pauline tendency, which set up an opposition to *the spirit* of Judaism from the beginning, had prevailed over the Judaized Christianity of John, could the fourth gospel appear at Ephesus.

So far we have endeavoured to keep the evidence in favour of apostolic authorship distinct from the fourth gospel, in order to simplify the discussion. But when one is treated of, the other must be regarded. Both books have been long current in the church under the name of John; and a partial comparison at least is necessary to a complete knowledge of either. Though the two may be understood apart, their authorship cannot be properly investigated without mutual reference; which will place general characteristics, as well as individual points, in a better light. It will not satisfy the demands of criticism merely to assume the non-authenticity of the gospel from the authenticity of the Apocalypse, or *vice versâ*, because respectable English scholars still maintain that both were written by the same author. Having shown as clearly as the nature of the question allows, that the one was written by the son of Zebedee, it remains for the critic to bring into view points of

resemblance and discrepancy as evidence for identity or diversity of origin.

The *Christology* of the Apocalypse is in apparent unison with that of the gospel. As the latter describes Jesus as the incarnate wisdom of God, the former uses language of similar tendency (Apoc. iii. 14, 20). His preëxistence is asserted in the gospel, as it is in Apocalypse iii. 14. The appellation *λόγος*, distinctive of person, occurs only in the gospel, first epistle, and Apocalypse. And as the evangelist says that the Logos was God, so Jesus bears the name of Jehovah in the Apocalypse.

We find the favourite *μαρτυρέω* and *μαρτυρία* of the gospel in the sense of *public profession*, or declaration of belief in the Saviour. The use of *νικᾶν* expressive of overcoming evil, opposition, and enmity in the world, is peculiar to the Apocalypse, first epistle of John, and fourth gospel.

Τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, to keep the word, a frequent phrase in the fourth gospel and first epistle, often occurs in the Apocalypse.

Σκηνοῦν, to tabernacle, is found only in the fourth gospel, besides the Revelation.

Σφάττειν, to slay, appears twice in the first epistle, and frequently in the Apocalypse.

Ἐχειν μέρος, to have part or share, is in the fourth gospel and the present book. So is *περιπατεῖν μετὰ Χριστοῦ*, to walk with Christ.

Ἐρχεται ὥρα, the hour is coming, is frequent in the gospel, and occurs twice in the Apocalypse.

Christ, or God, is often termed *ἀληθινός*, the true; so in the gospel Christ is called the true light; and God is the true God, in the first epistle.

In Apocalypse ii. 17, Jesus promises believers the hidden manna; in the gospel, the true bread from heaven.

Christ is often styled in our book a lamb; an epithet nowhere else applied to him except in the fourth gospel.

The image of Christ as a shepherd is found in Apoc. vii. 17, and in the gospel, x. 1, &c.

Living water, or the water of life, is promised to the believer, in Apocalypse xxi. 6; xxii. 17; and gospel, vii. 37.

The comparison of Christ with a bridegroom in the fourth gospel, iii. 29, should be put by the side of Apocalypse xix. 7; xxi. 2; xxii. 17, on account of the diction.

In the Apocalypse it is said of the Jews who do not believe in Jesus that they are not true Jews; so in the fourth gospel, viii. 39, 40.

In ii. 11 a promise is made to him that overcometh, that he shall not be hurt by the second death; in the fourth gospel,

it is said of him that keeps Jesus's word, that he shall never see death.

In xiv. 15 a call is addressed to the angel to thrust in his sickle and reap, because reaping-time is come, and the harvest of the earth is ripe. So in the gospel Jesus says to his disciples, "Look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest."

In Apocalypse vii. 15 he that sits upon the throne is said to dwell among the saints; an idea similar to that in the gospel (xiv. 23), where the Father and the Son are said to take up their abode with the believer. The same thought is in Apocalypse iii. 20; xxi. 22; xxii. 5.

In xiv. 14 the hundred and forty-four thousand sealed ones follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes (ἀκολουθέω, ὑπάγω); so Jesus says to Peter, "Whither I go (ὑπάγω), thou canst not follow (ἀκολουθέω) me now," &c.

The phrase "Lord, or sir, thou knowest," κύριε, σὺ οἶδας, is common to the Apocalypse and the fourth gospel.

Γράφειν followed by εἰς before the noun signifying the object on which the writing is made, is peculiar to the Apocalypse and gospel.

In the gospel there is an account of piercing Jesus's side with a spear; to which act is applied a prediction in Zechariah (xii. 10). In the Apocalypse the same version as that of the gospel is exhibited. And as it is a new one (ἐξεκέντησαν), not that of the Seventy, it has been inferred that the same hand appears in both passages.

The manner of writing in the Apocalypse often reminds one of that in the fourth gospel and first epistle, where the same idea is expressed both positively and negatively, and where a certain parallelism of thought and expression may be noticed.

More specimens of resemblance than these have been collected by such writers as Donker-Curtius, Dannemann, and Stuart, to prove identity of authorship in the Apocalypse and fourth gospel. We have given the most striking and plausible ones. The reader must judge of their force, and draw his own conclusion. Some may be thought far-fetched, though most do not appear in that light. Stuart's list needs sifting; because he does not scruple to use the 21st chapter of the fourth gospel throughout, as if it were unquestionably a genuine part of the work, though that position has been ably disputed on critical grounds by Lücke and others. It is easy to see the weakness of Stuart's reasoning when he asserts that John is familiar with the neuter ἀπρίον; whereas it occurs but once in the gospel, and that too in the 21st chapter. And it is surely a proof of haste to adduce the spurious 1 John 7 as

an instance of the application of Logos to Christ. In short, he makes several rash assertions, which his examples sometimes fail to support; as under the head of *the omniscience* of Christ, where some irrelevant places are given from the gospel and Apocalypse. But, after every reasonable deduction, enough remains to prove that the correspondences between the Apocalypse and fourth gospel are not accidental. They either betray one author, or show that the writer of the one was acquainted with the other, as well as influenced by its conceptions and language. These cognate phenomena have not been allowed their full force by Lücke, Ewald, De Wette, and Düsterdieck. On which side originality lies appears from the internal relation of the two books to one another, more than from their external form and expression. The Revelation betrays a tendency of mind akin to what is known as Jewish Christianity in its first development; whereas a higher degree of religious progression belongs to the gospel. The development of the religious conception commonly begins with the sensuous and concrete, which it seeks to spiritualise and make abstract. It needs no argument to prove that the expressions and ideas common to the two works have a more spiritual and abstract bearing in the gospel. The evangelist purposely attaches himself to the forms of the apocalypticist, even after their original signification had been laid aside. Perhaps he wished his work to pass for that of the apostle.

The strongest apparent coincidence is in the Christology. Here three particulars bear considerable resemblance to the fourth gospel, viz. Christ's designation as *the beginning of the creation of God*; the attribution to him of the name and predicates of Jehovah; and the appellation, *the Word of God*. The first of these denotes the preëxistence of Christ. As it has parallels in the Pauline epistles, we deem it hazardous, with Zeller, to regard the phrase as a mere honorary title rather than a doctrinal predicate to be taken literally. Though the expression be obscure, it seems to us most natural to understand it in the sense of *the first created being*, the highest creature. But the fourth gospel makes the Logos or Word representing Messiah to have *created all things*. Again, Jesus, or the Messiah, is expressly termed the Alpha and Omega, which is merely a periphrasis for *Jehovah*; and the new name of Messiah, which none knows but himself, is the unutterable name, the *Shem Hamphorash*. Yet *the name* does not lead to the conclusion that *the nature* of Jehovah belongs to the Messiah. It is an old Rabbinic tradition* that the name Jehovah belongs to three things—the Messiah, the righteous, and Jerusalem;

* Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, vol. i. p. 449.

which is proved by Jeremiah xxiii. 6; Isaiah xliii. 7; Ezekiel xlviii. 35. That the apocalyptist alludes to this tradition is highly probable, because the faithful are represented as having the name of God and that of the New Jerusalem, and the new name of Messiah, written on their foreheads; the name being none other than Jehovah. Besides, the angel *Metatron*, in Jewish doctrine, is also called Jehovah;* showing that the title is given to creatures.

The Messiah is called *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* (xix. 13); but in the gospel he is called *ὁ λόγος* absolutely. A different theological standpoint is evinced in the two expressions. The former savours of Palestinian, the latter of Alexandrian, metaphysics. The one is the well-known *מִימְרָא דִּי יְהֵוָה* of the Targums; the other reminds us of Philo.

It should also be noticed, that while the heavenly name of Messiah is called a *new name* (Rev. iii. 12), the gospel contains the words of Jesus to the Father, "Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world" (xvii. 24).

In this case similarity of expression has led some critics to assume greater agreement between the descriptions of Christ's person in the Apocalypse and gospel than really exists. The heavenly nature and preëxistence of Messiah was a later Jewish doctrine, which was gradually taken into the circle of Christian ideas, and developed there. In the gospel it has reached a higher stage of unfolding than in the Apocalypse.

The most striking mutual term is *ἐκκεντέω*, the new representative of the Hebrew *דָּקַר* in Zechariah xii. 10, applied in both works to the piercing of the Saviour, and different from the Septuagint word. It is precarious, perhaps, to found identity of authorship on the use of a mere word; yet its connexion is a peculiar one. We might conjecture, with Ewald, that the Septuagint had the verb *ἐκκεντέω* at first in its text; but the assumption is too hazardous. Nor does it relieve the difficulty felt by those who argue against identity of authorship, to say that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion translate the Hebrew verb by this very apocalyptic word; or that the evangelist refers to the fact of Christ's side being pierced with a spear; whereas the apocalyptist alludes to the slaying of him generally,—the extreme manifestation of hostile belief.

On the other hand, the characteristic mode in which the writer of the Apocalypse views beings, scenes, and objects, betrays a different person from the evangelist. His intuitional nature is of another cast, and employs a different expression. The view of the one is *sensuous*; that of the other *spiritual* and

* Gfrörer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils, vol. i. pp. 318, 319.

mystic. In the apocalypticist, fancy is creative and lively; in the evangelist, calmness prevails. The objective predominates in the one; speculative depth, gracious trust, a loving freedom of spirit, in the other. The one is introspective, looking at spiritual things and relations with a finely tender psychological organisation which attracts the reader; the other is of rougher mould, viewing things in concrete, plastic forms. Quiet contemplation has full scope in the evangelist; mildness and love find utterance in affectionate discourse. But the spirit of the apocalypticist is stern and vengeful, with cutting reproofs, calls to repentance, commands and threatenings. Here indeed the promises are rich, and bear a pregnant form suited to the majesty of the book. According to the writer of the fourth gospel, happiness arises essentially from faith in the Saviour on earth; and therefore the reader receives the impression that blessedness is a present possession; whereas according to the apocalypticist, the righteous pray for vengeance, and are restored to life in the first resurrection, that they may reign with Christ a thousand years. In short, the gospel presents an idealising universalist tendency which breaks away from the Judaic basis, and sets forth the Redeemer's person, his grace and truth, over against that of Moses, proclaiming him as the light and life of the world. In the Apocalypse, Christ is the external conqueror of his enemies, whose *power* rather than *grace* is exhibited. His coming to *reign outwardly* fills the mind of the seer, instead of his *spiritual sway* in the heart. Again, a sharp, definite, decided tone appears in sentences short and unconnected, without internal pliancy. But the evangelist's method of writing has a circumstantiality foreign to the apocalypticist. It is difficult to make this argument palpable to the reader; because it rests in part on subjective tact and taste. Its reality can be *felt* more easily than *described*. Based on a careful survey of all the literature that passes under the name of John, it forces itself on the mind of him that surrenders himself to the natural effect. When he perceives the difference of the spiritual elements in which the evangelist and apocalypticist move, their characteristic modes of spiritual apprehension, and the views they take of religious phenomena, creating different casts of style and diction, he will infer that the one cannot be identified with the other. Power and majesty, poetic energy and fancy, are scarcely consistent with the philosophical idealising which an emotional tenderness permeates and occasionally conceals. The fervour of the evangelist was not fiery; it was subdued by love. A charm lies in the composition of the one; a solemn grandeur in that of the other. The one presents refine-

ment and philosophical cultivation; the other, sublime mystery and sensuous symbolism. We need only institute a comparison between certain phenomena in the Apocalypse and fourth gospel to see how unlike they are. Thus the long series of plagues which precede the coming of the Lord is introduced by demoniacal beings, such as scorpion-like locusts, or lion-headed horses, with fire, smoke, and brimstone issuing out of their mouths, and strange riders, in an objective and artificial imagery foreign to the spiritual idiosyncrasy of the evangelist.

Agreeably to these observations it should be noticed, that the doctrinal type of the book before us is not exactly the same as that presented in the fourth gospel and first epistle. Thus, in *eschatology*, it has a first and second resurrection—a thing unknown to the writings of the New Testament; for though the evangelist speaks of a twofold resurrection (v. 21-30), the second only, which occurs at the Lord's return, is literal; the other being a spiritual resurrection from sin (v. 24-27, 1 Epist. iii. 14). In like manner, the idea of Antichrist differs in the Apocalypse and first epistle of John. The Antichrist of the former is a notable instrument of Satan; but the Antichrist of the latter is a concentration of many antichrists, who destroys Christianity from within, by corrupting its fundamental faith. The Antichrist of the apocalyptist is outside Christianity, hating both Jews and Christians. False prophets are termed Antichrist in the first epistle.

The doctrine of *redemption*, so far as allusions to it in the book enable us to judge, is more Jewish than in the gospel. It is represented by the strong figure of *washing in blood*, which is of Jewish origin; but certain terms, such as ἀπλόν, ἀγοράζειν, δωρεάν, κλητοί, resemble Paul's manner. Christianity at first was strongly impregnated with Old Testament ideas of sacrifice and atonement, which were more sensuous than spiritual; and some time was required for leavening it with the pure essence of the gospel. The love of God in sending his Son into the world to be the life and light of men, quickening within them that higher principle which sin debases, broke through the grosser conceptions of propitiation which the Jewish Christians inherited from their fathers, only by degrees.

Though the apocalyptist wrote in Greek, he followed Hebrew sources, especially the later prophets, Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, perhaps Enoch. So thoroughly Judaic is he, that there are examples of what was afterwards developed in a bad form in Judaism under the name of Kabbala, as in xiii. 18, where the mysterious number of the beast sounds as *Gematria*. The sacred number seven, which enters into the plan of the book, as well as that of three, savours of Kabbalism; so does the

description of the heavenly Jerusalem in the twenty-first and twenty-second chapters.

The views of angels, demons, and spirits are also Jewish, unlike those of the fourth gospel. The seven spirits are said to be before the throne of the Almighty (i. 4), meaning the seven highest spirits; an idea taken from the Zoroastrian religion into the Jewish, as we see from Zechariah, iv. 2-10, but modified in the Hebrew conception, so that in our book the seven spirits are representatives of the one Spirit of God. So intimately are these seven associated with the Supreme, that grace and peace are invoked from them equally with him. An angel-interpreter attends to John; seven angels sound trumpets, and the same number pour out vessels filled with the divine wrath; an angel comes down from heaven; an angel stands on the sea; an angel has a book in his hand; an angel takes up a great stone; an angel of the waters is spoken of, &c. Lücke correctly remarks, that the fourth gospel employs angels only on moral and spiritual errands; while the Apocalypse makes them preside over the phenomena of nature. It is inappropriate to quote, as Stuart does, the analogous case of the angel at the pool of Bethesda, in proof of the gospel representing angelic control over the material elements, because the passage is spurious. In like manner, Hengstenberg adduces the same place without the least hint of its later interpolation. We cannot agree with Stuart's assertion, that there is no case in the Apocalypse which is not justified by analogy in the Hebrew Scriptures; for where does the Old Testament present an example of an angel taking up a great millstone and casting it into the sea? This angelology plays an important part in the book, showing its likeness to the apocalyptic Daniel and Enoch. We admit that the envelope of visions in which the author clothes his Messianic hopes required some such spiritual machinery as that of angels; but they are introduced so frequently, and the representations of them are so peculiar, as to show another idiosyncrasy than the evangelist's. The view of demons is also singular. Out of the mouths of the three confederate beasts three unclean spirits issue; and these are termed the spirits of demons, seducing the kings of the earth by bringing them to join the antichristian leader in his attack upon Rome. In like manner, Satan is conspicuous in the Apocalypse; he is even chained and loosed again; he is the great dragon, the arch-enemy of the faithful; he is described at the head of other spirits; is cast out of heaven with them to the earth; and is said to have accused the brethren before God continually. Some of these ideas resemble Pauline ones, but are unlike any thing in the fourth gospel or first epistle.

The language of the book is very different from that of the

fourth gospel. It departs materially from the usual Greek of the New Testament, presenting anomalies, incorrectnesses, peculiar constructions, and awkward dispositions of words, which cannot be paralleled. These originate in Hebraism; the Greek being so moulded by Hebrew as to follow its constructions.

With respect to *cases*, the unusual license is taken of discontinuing the genitive case for a nominative, as in iii. 12; xiv. 12; or the accusative for a nominative, as in xx. 2. In vii. 9 the nominative is discontinued for the accusative.

Greek usage is often violated in gender and number, as in vi. 9, 10; ix. 13, 14. Neuters plural take plural verbs (xi. 18; xv. 4, &c.); *ἄνθρωπος* is both masculine and feminine in xiv. 19; so is *ἵππος*. In xii. 5 *ὁὖτος ἄρσεν* is merely an imitation of *זֶה זָכָר*.

In regard to verbs, the apocalyptist uses the future like the Hebrew imperfect in a frequentative sense, as at iv. 9-11. The participle stands for a finite tense in i. 16; while the present passes into the future in i. 7; or into the past, xii. 2-4. The future and past tenses are strangely mixed in xx. 7-10.

In the syntax of nouns the plural regularly stands for the dual, as in xii. 14.

The genitive case is always put after a noun to explain it, in the manner of an adjective; and a number of adjectives are linked together, as at xvi. 19.

Two nouns coupled together by a conjunction have each its own suffix, as in Hebrew, vi. 11; ix. 21.

The repetition of a preposition with each connected genitive often occurs, xvi. 13.

The genitive absolute seems wanting, unless there be an example of it in ix. 9, which is doubtful.

Ἐν is almost always prefixed to the dative of the instrument, as in vi. 8. The usage of the writer in prepositions and conjunctions is quite Hebraised. Thus we have the nominative after *ὥς*, where another case should have stood, iv. 7. This is from *כִּי* prefixed.

The verb *διδάσκειν* is followed by a dative case (ii. 14), following the Hebrew; *ἐκδικεῖν* has *ἐκ* with a genitive (vi. 10), equivalent to *מִן* followed by the prefix *מִן*; and *ἀκολουθεῖν* has *μετὰ* with the genitive (vi. 8), like *אַחֲרַיִם*. Greek and Hebrew constructions are remarkably intermingled in xvii. 4.

These remarks show that the language differs from that of the evangelist. Grammatically irregular and syntactically harsh, it is so thoroughly Hebraistic as to neglect the usual Greek rules. "The solecisms that appear in the Apocalypse," says Winer, "give the diction the impress of great harshness; but they are capable of explanation, partly from anacoluthon and the mingling of two constructions; partly in another man-

ner. Such explanation should always have been adopted, instead of ascribing the irregularities to the ignorance of the author, who, in other constructions of a more difficult nature in this very book, shows that he was exceedingly well acquainted with the rules of grammar. For most of these anomalies also examples may be found in the Greek writers, with this difference alone, that they do not follow one another so frequently as in the Apocalypse.* We can subscribe to this language in part without approving the apologetic details which the same scholar gives elsewhere,† in attempting to justify and parallel what cannot be done to the extent supposed.

It is unquestionable that the Greek of the apocalypticist is worse than that of any New Testament writer—the kind of diction which might be expected from an “unlearned and ignorant man,” as John is called in the Acts (iv. 12). But in the use of Hebraisms he is at home. His Rabbinic mode of expression, though artificial, is good. His Palestinian education qualified him for Rabbinical forms, as well as his study of the Old Testament prophecies. This applies to the synoptists and Paul; but not to the same extent. The apostle was undoubtedly a “learned man” in relation to the sacred literature of his own nation, his knowledge of the Old Testament, and probably of the Septuagint. We restrict the epithets ἀγράμματος and ἰδιώτης, so far as they are correct, to his Greek culture, and facility of writing in the new language which had almost supplanted Hebrew and Aramæan.

After all the endeavours to find analogies to the linguistic peculiarities and departures from good Greek usage in the book before us, either in the Greek Testament itself or in classical Greek writers, it presents anomalies of such a nature and in such number as to separate the author widely from the evangelist, and from any New Testament author. Such Hebrew-Greek stands apart and unique.

The apologies which the peculiarity in question have cost some critics may be seen in Professor Stuart, who has often misapprehended the true state of the question, or wrapped it in a multitude of irrelevant words. Yet he is often foiled, and has to confess the uniqueness of an expression in the book; as in xxi. 21, where ἀνὰ εἰς ἕκαστος cannot be paralleled; and in ii. 13, where he would drop ὅς out of the text. “Is not the Apocalypse,” asks the same critic, “the production of an excited state of mind, and of the most vivid feeling? Is it not prophetic poetry?” Granted; and the answer is still insufficient to explain the phenomena. The same reasoning applied to the

* Grammatik, fünfte Auflage, pp. 273, 274.

† Exegetische Studien, i. p. 154 et seqq.

Old Testament prophets, which the critic must surely allow, would justify the expectation of frequent and peculiar Hebrew constructions in them. Do they not write the same kind of Hebrew as the sacred historians and poets? Does any of them violate Hebrew construction extensively, because he was in an excited state of mind? He does not. We must not deprive the apocalyptist of conscious calmness when he wrote. Indeed, the very fact of his writing in Greek, and yet following Hebrew so much,—the fact of his knowing both the Septuagint and its Hebrew original,—militates against the peculiarities he exhibits.

The phenomena now stated should be attentively considered in their bearing on authorship. Some, perhaps, will still think that they are compatible with the hypothesis of the same writer. But when we find an absence of the evangelist's characteristic expressions, or of such at least as suit apocalyptic ideas,—or when we see the apocalyptist using favourite words and phrases foreign to the evangelist, and not inseparably united with the apocalyptic circle of expressions,—the argument is strengthened against identity of authorship. In like manner, the new form given to the evangelist's terms, and the new sense they are used in, show diversity. Thus the apocalyptist uses τὸ ἀρνίον, which never occurs in the gospel, where ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ appears. Ἀρνίον indeed is found in the gospel xxi. 15, but that chapter does not belong to the same writer. The verb νικᾶν is common to the gospel and the Revelation; but in the former a definite object accompanies it, such as *the world, the evil one*; while the latter uses it absolutely. The gospel has ψεύστης, the Apocalypse ψεύδης. The latter writes Ἱερουσαλὴμ, the former Ἱερουσόλυμα. Ἰδοὺ of the Apocalypse is ἴδε in the gospel.

These differences, doctrinal, theological, linguistic, are variously explained by apologists, especially by Donker-Curtius, Kolthoff, Dannemann, and Stuart, who either try to find the same or similar words in the gospel and Apocalypse, overlooking those which are *characteristic* in each.

Three causes are commonly assigned for all the diversities; viz. difference of subject, of age in the apostle, and of mental state. Of these, the first should be allowed to have its weight. The Apocalypse is in the main a prophetic book. It portrays the future in poetical colours. Yet the epistles to the seven churches are of the same character with the first epistle of St. John, and should be a fair subject of comparison. Here diversity is more prominent than likeness. A different tone and style appear. The compositions are *characteristically* different.

We place little reliance on the argument of age, though Olshausen and Guerike think it weighty. Written, as they believe, twenty years before the fourth gospel, the Revelation shows marks of inexperience in composition, of an ardent temperament, and of youthful fire. It is like the first essay of one expressing his ideas in a language to which he was unaccustomed. But the author must have been about sixty years of age when he wrote,—a time when inexperience and youthful fire are past. A comparison of the earlier and later epistles of St. Paul shows the insufficiency of time to account for the characteristic differences between the evangelist and apocalypticist. Nothing but the hypothesis of two persons can explain them; and Kolthoff's* reference to the earlier and later epistles of St. Paul as an analogy is beside the mark.

Others find the chief cause of diversity in the author's phrase, *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι*, *I was in the spirit* (i. 10). Hengstenberg supposes that he was in an *ecstatic* state; or at least in a passive condition of mind, the recipient of things communicated. The visions and their colouring were *given*, says Ebrard; whereas in the fourth gospel and epistles John's own reflectiveness appears. His mind was active in the latter, but passive in the former. We object to this assumption, because it deprives the author of his own consciousness, and is contrary to the analogy of prophecy. The Old Testament seers were never without consciousness, even in their highest moments of inspiration. Their own individuality appears throughout. Each has his characteristic peculiarities of conception and language. So must the author of the Apocalypse have. Ezekiel and Zechariah had visions; yet their own reflectiveness is manifest. We must not convert the writer into a machine or unconscious agent in the hand of the Spirit.

If, indeed, the apocalypticist had written down the visions at the very time he received them, the idea that he was overpowered by the substance of the communications and had little or no regard to readers, might appear more plausible; but the fact of their not being written in Patmos, shows that their present form proceeds from later and calm conception. How could he fall back into the Aramæan colouring, which was natural to him, if his mind had been divested of it long since? Would he not have retained his proper manner?

In a question like that before us, it is fortunate to have the decided weight of external evidence in favour of the apostolic authorship of Revelation, along with the preponderance of the internal. The entire cast of the work, all its distinguishing features of conception, delineation, style, diction, manner, har-

* Apocalypsis Joanni Apostolo vindicata, &c. p. 110.

monise with historical tradition. The evangelist is not identical with the apocalyptist; their minds are of a different complexion and grasp. The whole method of their description varies. The writer of the present book departs from the usual syntax. Whatever deductions be made on the ground that the work is prophetic poetry, not prose; that the author was a younger man when he wrote the Apocalypse; that the character of his inspiration was higher; that his object was different; that he should not be restricted to the same circle of ideas and language; enough remains to show another. There are two idiosyncrasies, characteristic differences, which occasional points of coincidence do not efface. Apologists have lessened the diversities, but their ingenuity has not succeeded in removing or fairly accounting for them.

Our conclusion is, that as John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse, he did not write the fourth gospel. Had John the presbyter been a disciple of the apostle, some might have attributed the authorship of the Apocalypse to him with greater probability, because John the presbyter might have thought it justifiable to introduce his instructor as the speaker, as he wrote in his manner. But the one John was not an immediate disciple of the other. According to Papias, John the presbyter was a disciple of the Lord. Hence most critics who deny the apostolicity of the book content themselves with the indefinite conjecture that it proceeded from a disciple of the apostle. But Credner and Ewald attribute the work to John the presbyter. No probability belongs to the hypothesis of Hitzig,* that the writer of the Revelation is John Mark, from whom the second gospel proceeded. His arguments are mainly based on analogies of language and construction, which weightier phenomena overpower.

In ascertaining *the time and place of writing*, there is some difficulty. The prevailing opinion has been, that the book was written A.D. 95 or 96, at Patmos, under Domitian, or after his death, in Nerva's reign. This accords with the tradition that John was banished to Patmos towards the close of Domitian's reign, where he had the visions described in the book. The fact of his being sent to Patmos is mentioned by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. Irenæus calls the emperor Domitian; Clement and Origen merely style him the *tyrant* or *king* of the Romans. Epiphanius makes him Claudius; the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, Nero, with which Theophylact and the younger Hippolytus agree. Again, the author of the *Synopsis de vita et morte prophetarum, apostolorum et discipulorum Domini*, said to be Dorotheus, bishop of

* Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften, 1843.

Tyre, names Trajan. The oldest form of the tradition is that in Irenæus, viz. that the apostle saw and wrote the visions towards the end of Domitian's reign, in Patmos, to which he had been banished. Later writers made a distinction between the time of the banishment and that of the composition, referring the latter to Ephesus, after the emperor's death. The tradition is neither consistent nor weighty. It will scarcely stand the test of criticism. Yet we cannot take the view of those who think that it originated in the words of i. 9. Probably the basis is historical. The apostle was compelled to withdraw to Patmos for a time. At first sight it might appear doubtful whether he was really banished thither. But the expressions, "for the word of God," "for the testimony of Jesus Christ," compared with their use in vi. 9; xii. 11; xx. 4, can only imply banishment or persecution, and will not bear a milder sense.

In the absence of external evidence, internal considerations come to our aid. The book itself shows that Jerusalem had not been destroyed; for if it had, the catastrophe could scarcely have been unnoticed. An event pregnant with momentous consequences to the cause of truth and the fate of the early Christians would have been surely mentioned. There are distinct allusions to the *impending* catastrophe. We see from xi. 1-14 that the holy city with the temple was not destroyed; for it is stated there that only a part of the city should perish, while the temple is supposed to be still standing. Had it been implied that both were destroyed, the fact would have been treated at some length. This is confirmed by xvii. 10: "And there are seven kings; five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come:" *i.e.* when the writer lived, five emperors had already fallen, the sixth was reigning, and the other had not yet come. The series begins with Augustus, so that Galba is the sixth,—"the king that is." Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero, are the five fallen ones; the seventh coming one, who must continue a short space, means the returning Nero, as appears from xiii. 3, 14. Other critics begin the series with Julius Cæsar, and fix upon Nero as the sixth, under whom John wrote. Galba is then the seventh, and he reigned but seven months, according to the prophecy. But this reckoning is faulty, since Julius Cæsar was not an Augustus; nor was it till the time of Augustus and his successors that the Romans ruled over Jerusalem. Others begin with Augustus, but make the sixth Vespasian; Otho, Galba, and Vitellius being passed over. It is arbitrary to omit these names. The most probable view is, that the book was composed under Galba, after Nero's death; which agrees best with "the beast that was, and is not, and yet is" (xvii. 8). The οὐκ ἔστι shows that he who is spoken of is no longer living;

and it is little better than special pleading in Stuart to refer it to the future, on the ground that the prophets employ the present for the future in predicting. The author is not predicting here, but is simply explaining who the beast is. The place in which the apostle wrote was Asia Minor, probably Ephesus itself, to which he had returned from Patmos. The visions were received in the barren island, and afterwards committed to writing at Ephesus, as is probable from the past tense of the verb in i. 9 (*ἔγενόμην*). This is favoured, among other circumstances, by the epistles being addressed to the seven churches.

On the basis of Irenæus's testimony it has been very generally believed that the book did not appear till Domitian's reign. The principal arguments adduced against an earlier date, such as the time of Galba or Nero, are the following:

Nero's persecution did not extend to the provinces: the Nicolaitans did not form a sect as early as 68 or 69, whereas they are spoken of as such: and the condition of the seven churches shows that they had been planted a considerable time.

If it were necessary to speak of the extent of the Neronian persecution, we should refer to Tertullian, who mentions *the laws* (*commentarios*) of Nero and Domitian against the Christians; an expression, says Milman, too distinct to pass for rhetoric even in that passionate writer. And Orosius expressly testifies to its extension beyond Rome.* While the spirit of hostility was active in the metropolis, we may fairly infer that the Christians in the provinces did not escape. What affected the centre with terror would affect the more distant parts of the empire. If persecution raged in Rome, it must soon have found its way to Asia Minor, as well as the various places where Christianity had been planted; for the emperor's example was infectious. That a martyr called Antipas had suffered death at Pergamos even in Nero's reign, need not excite surprise. But it is not necessary to assume that he was slain under that emperor. Individual Christians may have suffered in the provinces even before his day. Heathen persecutions in Asia Minor awakened in the minds of Christians the hope of Christ's speedy reappearance. The writer beheld the coming struggle. Heathen magistrates as well as Jews were ever ready to put forth their enmity, even when the edicts of emperors forbade injury to the persons of Christians.

As to the Nicolaitans, Irenæus speaks of such a sect in his time, deriving the name from the deacon Nicolas (*Acts vi.*), and referring the allusion in the Apocalypse to it. The sect of the Nicolaitans mentioned by Clement of Alexandria is probably not

* "Romæ Christianos supplicii et mortibus affecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciarî imperavit." *Adversus Paganos*, lib. vii. 7.

the same with that here. Nor is there any proof in the book itself that the Nicolaitans formed a sect. Their doctrine was not speculative, but practical; a kind of antinomianism, which encouraged sinfulness of life. The writer finds a certain resemblance between their conduct and the morality of Balaam, which led to heathenism. The Balaamites and Nicolaitans were not two *heretical sects*, as some have supposed: the lax morality of the latter *resembled* that of old Balaam. They were a class of men within the Ephesian church, not a *sect*. It does not seem probable that these Nicolaitans were the adherents of Pauline free grace, as the Tübingen critics usually suppose; or that John wrote with a polemic object against Paul's doctrine. The name is symbolical, formed with reference to the word Balaam. Still further: a close examination of the language addressed to each of the churches will show its appropriateness, even A.D. 68 or 69. About A.D. 61 the church at Ephesus is commended by Paul for the faith and love of its members, which is consistent with the language of Apocalypse ii. 2, 3; and both are compatible with the charge that they had left their first love. In the lapse of a very few years, amid trying circumstances, the ardour of new converts is liable to cool. The patience for which they are commended refers, as the context shows, to the temptations they suffered from corrupting teachers, and the difficulties attendant on the faithful exercise of discipline in the church. The case of the church at Smyrna was similar.

As to the *class of writings to which the Apocalypse belongs*, Pareus seems to have been the first who thought it a prophetic drama. A like opinion was afterwards held by Hartwig, who terms it a symbolical dramatic poem. This view the genius of Eichhorn elaborated with much ability. Hence the hypothesis of its being a regular dramatic poem is commonly associated with his name. He makes the following divisions: the title, i. 1-3; the prologue, i. 4—iv. 22; the drama, in three acts, preceded by a prelude, iv. 1—xxii. 5. The prelude consists of iv. 1—viii. 5. The first act (viii. 6—xii. 17) sets forth, in three scenes, the destruction of Jerusalem, the overcoming of Judaism, and the Church's weak condition after that catastrophe. The second act (xii. 18—xx. 10) represents the downfall of heathenism. The third act (xx. 11—xxii. 5) describes the heavenly Jerusalem descending from heaven. The epilogue (xxii. 6-11) contains a threefold address, that of the angel, of Christ, and of John.* This theory needs no confutation at the present day. However ingenious, it is baseless. When Stuart calls the poem an *epopee*, the name is as objectionable as that of drama.

The object for which the apostle wrote was to set forth the

* Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis, vol. i. p. xix. et sqq.

immediate coming of the Lord, in order to support his fellow Christians under calamities already endured and still impending, to foster hope and discourage apostasy. The world had shown its opposition to the truth, and would exhibit still greater hostility. Hence believers in Christ were encouraged to look for his speedy reappearance, and to hold fast their profession. By steadfast adherence to the gospel, the redeemed should receive the blessed reward which their master had to bestow. The circumstances seemed sufficiently alarming. The misery of war, the terrors of frequent executions, the perplexities of political affairs, anxious hopes and fears of the future, had produced great excitement among the Christians, and especially such as had not attained to the spiritual views of Paul, in whose sight Judaism had become a thing of the past. The majority looked for a great revolution, which, beginning with the purification of Jerusalem and the downfall of Rome, should issue in the return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of the world, and the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. Their hopes were raised to the highest pitch. Christ, indeed, had come once; but that advent fell short of their ideal desires. The humbleness of his person and claims disappointed many. They sighed for another and more glorious manifestation, as they had been taught to believe. The heathen seemed to have concentrated their strength against the followers of the new religion. Calamities already endured looked as though they were the prelude to greater. The atmosphere was lowering. Well might the disciples of Jesus in Asia Minor tremble. Some had fallen away, needing repentance and return to their first love. The weak had yielded to temptation. Hence it was necessary to reprove as well as console, to censure as well as to encourage. The *central idea* of the book is the Lord's second coming, forming both its prophetic and hortatory character. Christ will soon appear, to destroy his enemies, and reward his followers in that new kingdom which he is to establish. The time is at hand; and therefore there is no cause for despair. The period of endurance is short. Nothing was better fitted to make them steadfast in the faith. The great event that formed the consummation of their hopes, the expected redemption to which their weary souls turned for solace, was nigh. The suffering may have sorrowfully thought that they should not be able to stand the shock of their fierce enemies; but the writer's views point to the triumph of truth and righteousness. Exalted honours, glorious rewards, await the Christian soldier who endures to the end. The patient believer shall receive a crown of victory, the Redeemer's approval, everlasting happiness in Messiah's peaceful kingdom on earth. With him he shall reign continually. Thus the

book arose out of specific circumstances, and was meant to serve a definite object. When the lot of the apostle was cast in troublous times, what better theme could he have to strengthen and comfort his fellow-disciples than the speedy reappearance of their Lord?

But what shall be said of the writer's belief in the immediate advent of his Lord a second time? Was he mistaken about the nearness of the event in his day? Events have shown that he was. "I believe," says an able lecturer on the book, "that the time of which St. John wrote was at hand when he wrote. I as little suppose him to have been mistaken about its nearness, as I suppose him to have been a wilful deceiver." If this be correct, Christ's coming is taken in an unnatural and allegorical sense, for it is explained away into the events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans and the subsequent triumph of Christianity; whereas the writer of the Apocalypse merely *connected* his advent with that catastrophe. He did not suppose, any more than St. Paul, that the one was identical with the other, or that the coming was aught else than literal and physical,—for the purpose of destroying his enemies, and setting up a new kingdom in renovated Jerusalem. Far be it from us to entertain the idea that the sacred writer was a wilful deceiver. But it is not inconsistent with his apostleship to believe that both he and the rest of the early disciples supposed the time of their Lord's return to be at hand. St. Paul's language in the first epistle to the Corinthians shows that he himself expected to be then alive. Not till a considerable time after the apostles did the adherents of Christianity generally begin to interpret the coming of the Lord spiritually; a fact which had an unfavourable influence on their judgment of the Apocalypse. Millennarians there still were who threw the predicted advent into the future; but the spiritual view prevailed over the carnal. Primitive Christianity was corrected and developed by the consciousness of the Church, in which the divine Spirit ever dwells. This development appears already in the fourth gospel, whose scope and genius are adverse to a speedy second advent like that of the Revelation.

If such be the principal aim of the seer, we ought not to look for secular history in the book. The kingdoms and nations of the world are not described in it. The genius of Christ's kingdom differs from that of earthly ones. It advances independently of, and frequently in opposition to, them. Hence it does not contain a syllabus of the world's history, or even of the Roman empire. Neither does it present a history of the Church. It relates to a great event which the author thought should soon happen. His horizon was limited and dim. His glances at

the immediate past are brief; he does not dwell upon the present, but alludes mainly to the near future, in which a mighty phenomenon filled the sphere of his vision—the coming of the Lord Jesus. Catastrophes and judgments usher in the mysterious drama—the inauguration of the Redeemer's triumph.

These remarks are fully sustained by the prologue and epilogue. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy; for the time is at hand." "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass." "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

In relation to its *general structure*, the work is disposed on a symmetrical but artificial plan, a knowledge of which is the safest guide to a right apprehension of the vision-drapery. *Seven* is the leading number throughout. There are seven spirits before the Father's throne, seven epistles to seven churches, seven stars, seven candlesticks, seven seals, seven eyes, seven horns, seven angels, seven trumpets, seven vials, seven heads on the beast, seven thunders. Subdivisions of this principal number are three and four. The phases of the future are three,—seals, trumpets, and vials. The first four scenes in each of these are closely connected, being separated from the following by a concluding figure. The seventh trumpet brings the description of three enemies, the dragon, the beast with seven heads and ten horns, and the other beast. The number seven is also subdivided into three and a half, or a time, times, and half a time (xii. 14). Thus some numbers play an important part in the arrangement, and determine the general method. The interpreter must carefully distinguish between such as are normal and those that are subordinate. Stuart has made too much of this principle of *numerosity*, as he terms it, without discriminating the numbers properly. Instead of making *three* the most conspicuous in the author's plan, he should have made it *seven*. *Three* and *four* are less prominent, being parts of seven. As to *ten* and *twelve*, they do not belong to the general disposition. Züllig is right in assigning the cardinal number, and his accuser is wrong.

We have now to speak of the *contents*.

The apocalyptic picture consists of a series of visions very like those of Daniel. The descriptions, colours, symbols, figures are taken from the Old Testament prophets, especially Zechariah, the author of Daniel's book, and Ezekiel. The second Esdras, and perhaps the book of Enoch, supplied various ideas. John lived and breathed in the Old Testament prophecies of a Messianic future. His originality lies in the combination of

scattered ideas, and the artificial construction of the book, where there is a patent unity. He revises the existing apocalyptic elements, expands the great Hebrew theocratic conception, adapting it to the progress of events, and forms all his materials, borrowed or otherwise, into a majestic whole, vitalised by the fiery breath of his genius.

The future is represented as written in a book with seven seals, which Christ alone could open; and the seer is permitted to have a view of its contents. As the seals are successively broken, calamities befall the righteous, putting their fidelity to the test. After the sixth, the believing people are sealed themselves with the name of God, for security against subsequent danger. At the opening of the seventh seal, seven angels with trumpets appear, announcing one after another various punishments on the evil world. On the sounding of the sixth trumpet, the people of God, or the elect, are concealed in the sanctuary at Jerusalem, and Israel is purified. The seventh trumpet is followed by a description of the hellish powers that oppose Messiah, with the announcement of their destruction. This is succeeded by the final catastrophe, or the outpouring of the vials of divine wrath, and the decisive battle. Rome falls by the returning antichristian emperor, who, in his turn falls before Messiah; the devil is chained for a thousand years, at the end of which he is let loose and besieges the holy city, but is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. Then come the resurrection, the general judgment, and eternal blessedness in the new Jerusalem.

Thus the seals, trumpets, and vials are successive phases in the development of the great drama. Though in some respects parallel, they increase in power as they near the final catastrophe. We need scarcely say, that the Messianic hopes of the seer were not fulfilled as his fancy and faith projected them. We cannot affirm that he uttered them as mere poetry, without all belief in their objective fulfilment. The Jews in Jerusalem were not separated and purified as John anticipated. All were destroyed, with the holy sanctuary and the city itself. Antichrist did not return from the east in the person of Nero, to devour and lay waste. Paganism indeed fell, and Christianity triumphed; but not so soon as represented, nor in that way. The first and second resurrections, with their associated events, did not happen. Nor did Christ come personally, destroying all opposing powers and persons in order to set up his everlasting kingdom. Yet there is spiritual truth in some of these descriptions. Christ came again by his Spirit, and is spiritually present with his people. His religion conquered heathenism. Imperial Rome fell. But the reign of blessedness has

yet to begin. The non-fulfilment of the seer's Messianic hopes arose in part from the fact that they were essentially Jewish-Christian. Had they been of the purely evangelical type, they would have presented a different aspect. Without objective sensuousness or close imitation of Daniel's visions, to which they are the sequel, they would have grasped the living power of the gospel, as Christ preached it when he was on earth, accompanied with the Spirit's operation on the hearts and lives of men. Above all, the love of God would have animated his pen—that great motive power which is to regenerate mankind. But this implies an ulterior development of Christian truth, totally divested of the husk of Judaism.

The book may be divided into three parts: viz. the introduction, consisting of chapters i.-iii.; the body, made up of a series of visions, iv.-xxii. 5; and the epilogue, xxii. 6-21.

I. (i.-iii.) This portion contains the inscription, i. 1-3; and the dedication, i. 4-8; with the direct address and letters to the seven churches of Asia.

II. The body of the work is naturally divided into two parts, iv.-ix. and x.-xxii. 5.

III. The epilogue may be subdivided into four pieces, viz. the conclusion of the visions, xxii. 6-9; the close of the prophecy, xxii. 10-17; the seer's final remarks, xxii. 18-20; and the epistolary termination, xxii. 21.

As the early Christians believed that Christ would come speedily, and associated with that great event the destruction of his enemies, the prophet paints the overthrow of heathenism, which he identifies with the Roman empire. And that empire again is symbolised by its head, Nero, who had recently fallen by his own hand. The story that Nero was not really dead, but had retired to the Euphrates, whence he would return with the Parthians, is here drawn by a Christian imagination. He is Antichrist. This interpretation is at least as old as Commodian (A.D. 270). The Roman power is personified and embodied in Nero, who would reappear in the character of Antichrist. The great persecutor of the Christians at that particular crisis was readily identified with Antichrist, because he elevated himself against Christ, and had struck terror into the pious by his cruelties. Thus the Apocalypse exhibits the triumph of Christianity over Paganism, which is equivalent to its *universal* victory. There is a gradual preparation for the catastrophe which ushers in the triumph. Dramatic scenes precede the consummation; and the reader is led on step by step, as it were, to the final issue.

Chapters iv.-vi. refer to the book having seven seals, which none but the Lamb could open. These seals denote the inci-

piant act of the judgment. After the seventh seal, the sounding of seven trumpets takes place, heralding the approach of the judgment (vii.-ix.).

The tenth chapter is a formal introduction to the following division, or the second part (xii.-xxii.). The sounding of the seventh angel-trumpet is naturally expected, with which the judgment actually begins; yet there is another delay instead. The end can only take place on earth. Hence the scene shifts from heaven to earth. A mighty angel descends from heaven, terrifying all with the thunder of his voice (x. 1, &c.). The eleventh chapter forms an episode. Before the seventh trumpet, Jerusalem is warned, and exhorted to repent in time. Moses and Elias, significant of the law and the prophets, testify in blood as the witnesses of the Lamb. The next vision describes the enemy of the Church, or the beginning of the executing of the judgment (xii. xiii.), which is succeeded by the vision of the seven vials, that is, the wrathful judgment itself (xiv.-xvi.), issuing in the fall of Babylon the metropolis, or the final overthrow of heathenism (xvii.-xix.). The last vision relates to the new Jerusalem, or the consummation of the judgment (xx.-xxii.).

It is worthy of remark, that the first four seals are separated from the last three. Time is gained by the episode of the vision of the souls of Christian martyrs, whose cry for vengeance on their heathen persecutors is not answered immediately. After the sixth seal is opened, it would appear that they have not long to wait, since the heathen rulers and magistrates flee from impending retribution. Even now, however, dominion is not given to the saints. The scene shifts, and a new vision is interposed. The people of God are sealed. At the opening of the seventh seal, the end is still deferred. There is a short period of breathless expectation. The import of the last seal is unfolded by means of the seven trumpets and seven vials, each bringing the final catastrophe nearer and nearer. This repeated postponement of the end serves to keep expectation alive, and shows the deep feeling of the prophet.

A brief notice of some leading features will throw light on the scope and meaning of the book.

First. The nature of the connexion between the eleventh and twelfth chapters is difficult to discover. The tenth chapter forms a transition to the second part of the work, and the eleventh intervenes. Hence the little book mentioned in x. 1 is the same as the book in v. 1. It is open in x. 1, because the seals had been loosed before. It is a *little* book, because its contents are concentrated, as it were, in a focus. What had hitherto been *idea* and *vision* to the prophet, now becomes historical and

actu
seer
(ἐσ
ver
para
wher
the
S
up
head
ten
thirt
dead
pow
depi
phen
or R
or th
catic
ome
Rom
of a
lette
7=
viz.
666,
this
but
1
•
which
1.
letter
to sec
2.
cause
spelle
3.
colle
horns
pears
the r
beast
expec
τοῦ κ
But i
pire.
empe
huma
of a n

actual. The scene shifts from heaven to earth. Hence the seer says in xii. 18 (xiii. 1), "I stood upon the sand of the sea" (*ἐστάθην*, not *ἐστάθη*); whereas he had been taken up to heaven at the commencement of the first part (iv. 1). The preparations for the impending event take place in heaven. But when it is on the eve of being carried into effect, earth must be the theatre.

Secondly. The beast with seven heads and ten horns rising up out of the sea symbolises the Roman power. The seven heads are identical with the seven kings or emperors; and the ten horns are the ten proconsuls, imperial vicergerents in the thirty provinces. The head, slain as it were, yet having its deadly wound healed, represents Nero. The dragon which gave power to the beast is Satan (xiii. 1, &c.). The same beast is depicted in xvii. 3, as scarlet-coloured, full of names of blasphemy. The woman on the beast is the great city Babylon or Rome, the metropolis of spiritual harlotry. The second beast, or the false prophet which helps the first beast, is a personification of false heathen prophecy, including magic, auguries, omens, &c., supporting idolatrous paganism concentrated in the Roman power.

Thirdly. The number of the beast is said to be the number of a man, 666 (xiii. 18). This is made up of the numeral letters קסר נרון, *Cæsar Nero* (ק=100, ס=60, ר=200; נ=50, ר=200, ו=6, ן=50, making 666). The shorter form of נרון, viz. נר, would make 616, which is a very ancient reading for 666, as we learn from Irenæus. Objection has been made to this explanation, that the author writes in Greek not Hebrew; but his style of thought is Hebrew.*

Fourthly. After the fourth angel sounds his trumpet, a

• A friend has forwarded the following objections to this interpretation, which we consider ingenious but not convincing:

1. As the Apocalypse is written in Greek, and the problem itself set in Greek letters, it is reasonable to suppose that the solution must be in Greek also; and to seek it in another language can scarcely be allowed.

2. The spelling of the words 'Nero Cæsar' in Hebrew is objectionable, because it is incorrect, the yod being omitted after the koph. Cæsar should be spelled קיסר, not קסר.

3. The beast of chapter xiii., in which the riddle is given, is the beast in his collective capacity; he is leopard, bear, and lion; has seven heads and ten horns,—an epitome of idolatrous imperial power (Dan. vii. 4-6). Nero appears here only as the *wounded head*. It is not till chapter xvii. 8, 11, that, as the reigning representative of the composite power, he is identified with the beast. Now as we know that the beasts of Daniel are empires, we naturally expect the beast of John to be an empire too; it is the final form of the *βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου*, the antagonist of *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* (chapters xi. and xii.). But if the beast symbolises a kingdom, that kingdom must be the Roman empire. The name of a man cannot be appealed to as indicating an individual emperor. It is a Hebraism, meaning only that the riddle is compassable by human wit. See Rev. xxi. 17, *the measure of a man*; and Isaiah viii. 1, *the pen of a man*,—on which last passage see Gesenius.

threefold woe is announced in viii. 13. In ix. 12 it is said that the first woe, corresponding to the fifth trumpet-sound, is past, and that two more are to come. In xi. 4 the second woe is past, and "behold the third woe cometh quickly." Yet the third woe is not mentioned afterwards. When or where did it come? Or did it take place at all? Hengstenberg affirms that the third woe and seventh trumpet-sound are in xi. 15-19; and explains the point arbitrarily. With Baur, we discover the third woe in xvi. 15, "Behold, I come as a thief." The Lord's sudden coming is identical with the third woe.

Fifthly. Some have thought that the eleventh chapter describes a catastrophe befalling Jerusalem similar to that which afterwards happens to Rome. In this view, the fall of Judaism and the fall of heathenism are leading phenomena in the book. Accordingly, Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and others suppose the general theme to be Christianity triumphing over Judaism and Paganism. The assumption is incorrect. What befalls Jerusalem is not a catastrophe or total destruction, but a partial judgment or purifying process. And the scene in which this is described is only a subordinate one in the drama of preparatory phenomena. Jerusalem is not destroyed, but preserved. The theocratic seed is spared. Believing Judaism is still an object of the divine favour. The author, himself a Jew, and having patriotic feelings which Christianity did not quench, supposes that the city and outer court of the temple would be trodden down by the heathen for three years and a half,—a number taken from the book of Daniel; but that the *sanctum* of the temple would be spared, with the worshipers in it during that period. James the Just was there, and other Jewish Christians, praying for the salvation of the nation. This is very different from the fate predicted for Rome, the persecuting and implacable enemy of the Christians. Total destruction awaits the new Babylon. Jerusalem would only suffer in part and for a season. The holy city would be spared, and the faithful inhabitants protected by Jehovah, while the unbelieving Jews would be destroyed. A comparatively small portion (the tenth) of the city falls, and only 7000 of the inhabitants; the majority being saved by penitence. If the event did not correspond to the hopes of the prophet, we ought not to be surprised. Inspiration did not enable the Jewish seer to predict definite events in the future; though his sympathies were right and true. The eleventh chapter should not be resolved into mere symbol, as it is by Eichhorn and Stuart.

Sixthly. *The millennium*, or thousand years' reign of the saints, has given rise to much discussion. While a few regard it as past, most interpreters consider it as still future. Among the New Testament writers, the millennium is peculiar to the apoca-

lyptist, though it was not new; many Rabbins having held it, as Gfrörer has shown.* The common view of the early Christians was, that the righteous and wicked would rise, with a short time intervening, and be judged by the coming Messiah. But John has two resurrections, separated by the space of a thousand years. Two resurrections was already a Jewish opinion, and is probably contained in the book of Daniel (xii. 2, &c.); but their separation by one thousand years is unique. The chaining and loosing of Satan during the millennium and at the end of it respectively, together with the attack of the heathen powers on the followers of the Lamb, are also singular. Such ideas do not agree well with the Saviour's discourse in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew; nor are they in perfect harmony with the Pauline passages in 1 Cor. xv. 23-28; 1 Thess. iv. 15-17; 2 Thess. i. 5-10; ii. 3-12. John's description is ideal. The seer gives expression to hopes and aspirations. He paints a subjective state of things, for which no objective correspondence in the future should be sought, else a poetical picture will be converted into literal prediction. That it is merely ideal, is seen from certain incongruities, such as the risen saints having their camp beside the earthly Jerusalem, and being attacked by heathen nations; as well as from the existence of heathen enemies, after it had been said (xix. 21) that all the inhabitants of the earth were slain.

Seventhly. We need not dwell upon the period described in the twenty-first and twenty-second chapters, as that of the *new heavens* and the *new earth*. Most take it to be what we are accustomed to call *heaven* or the heavenly state; while some, as Hammond, Hug, and Bush think that it alludes to an earthly flourishing state of the Church. The ideas and imagery are taken from Isaiah liv. 11, 12; lx. 3-11; lxv. 17-20; lxvi. 22. The future renovation of the earth was a prevailing notion of the Jews, after their captivity in Babylon. Here the prophet drew from the Deutero-Isaiah in part, and partly from his own imagination. His ideal hopes are, that heaven and earth should become one in the future kingdom of Messiah. Earth becomes heaven, and heaven descends to earth. The holy Church of Christ's faithful ones, in her triumphant state, is the fulfilment of all that was associated with ancient Jerusalem in the Hebrew heart. She is depicted as God's dwelling-place—the holy city, new Jerusalem, the chaste spouse of Christ, the Lamb's wife. This is the highest aim of all apocalyptic prophecy, the everlasting completion of the mystery of God. The description, which is largely ideal, embodies the writer's prophetic ideas respecting the consummation of the Christian Church; or, in other words, the everlasting happiness of the righteous. To attempt

* Das Jahrhundert des Heils, ii. p. 198 et seqq., 210.

to find particulars corresponding to the figures employed, would be to convert poetry into prose—the subjective into the objective. The conceptions of the seer should be left in their indefiniteness, else their beauty vanishes. No mystical meaning lies in the details. Elements expressive of magnificence and splendour are combined to aid the rhetorical beauty of the composition. A new Jerusalem symbolises a new state of things; for all the ideas of earthly greatness and excellence entertained by the Jews were centered in their beloved city.

The question of authorship has been usually thought to affect that of *canonicity and value*. Yet the book may not have proceeded from an apostle, and be equal in value to his acknowledged production. Luke was only an evangelist, yet his writings are justly in the New Testament canon. It is not of essential moment that the Revelation should be written by John the son of Zebedee. The value does not depend so much on canonicity as contents. Degrees of excellence attach to the canonical writings. We are far from denying that *authorship* is of consequence: it is not of the highest. The evangelist who wrote the fourth gospel and John the apostle would necessarily write differently, because their mental development was unequal. Inspired by the divine Spirit, their ideas, and the mode of expressing them, might still differ. Apostles themselves were not equally gifted. The Apocalypse is not of the same authority as if it had been written by Paul. The Judaic texture it bears, the story respecting Nero coming back from the East with a Parthian army, after he had taken away his own life, and the part which that emperor occupies in the apocalyptic prophecy generally, do not consist with Pauline sentiments. The inquirer feels that the more he examines, the stronger is his belief that the book does not breathe the same spirit as that of the fourth gospel, nor does it strictly accord with the Church's destination. The proper evangelical element, which we see in Matthew xxiv. 14, Romans xi. 25, is in the background; and the general tone of the work clashes with Mark xiii. 32. Thus the inspiration of the writer was not so high as that of St. Paul. The book occupies a less philosophical standpoint than the fourth gospel, or Paul's epistles. Yet it has exerted, and will continue to exert, a great spiritual influence upon mankind. The effects of a certain moral expression in its symbolical descriptions are decided. Much value belongs to its prophetic utterances in moving and strengthening the soul, in bearing it upward to the throne of God amid suffering, sorrow, and persecution, in attracting its sympathies towards the faithful followers of the Lamb, and in exciting aspirations which can only be realised in the new Jerusalem so

gorgeously painted at the close. The general tenor of the work is elevating. Alluring promises console the righteous; awful warnings deter them from unfaithfulness to their vocation: the vengeance of the Almighty appals the wicked. The grandeur of the book impresses the spirit most forcibly, urging it onward in the difficult path of duty with the hope of a glorious crown, a golden harp, celestial fruits, refreshing waters of the river of life; the hope of living and reigning with the Lamb in perpetual blessedness. Not till we begin to examine the various contents do we perceive the lower place it occupies in the development of Christianity.

Schemes of interpretation, whether *preterist*, *continuous*, or *future*, which the different commentators have adopted, must be rejected, with the exception of the first. Expositors of the continuous and futurist class fall into the fatal error of converting apocalyptic poetry into historical prose, and of making all symbols significant. Nor are preterists usually free from blame. In applying their principle of interpretation, they are sure to err if they endeavour to show that all was *properly fulfilled* in the immediate future, or that the seer was every where guided infallibly in his prognostications and hopes. The apostle's standpoint should be correctly estimated. His idiosyncrasy must be apprehended. The mode in which the old prophets depicted the future should be known, not as if they were able to predict definite events succeeding one another in the arrangements of providence, but as they dimly saw the things to which their enraptured spirits were carried forward, and painted them in ideal colours. Their own sentiments, hopes, desires, and fears are elements in the pictures they drew,—pictures whose general outline alone should be considered *real* to them, though it may be so to us in a very different sense.

To enumerate all the *mistakes committed* by interpreters of the Apocalypse would be impossible. We can only glance at a few prominent ones.

First. The historic basis should not be abandoned, else imagination will have ample range for wild extravagance. The writer did not forego time and place, elements that cannot safely be neglected by the interpreter. Thus he states that the things must *shortly* come to pass, and that the time is *at hand*. So likewise at the close it is said that the things must *shortly* be done. The Saviour affirms, "Behold, I come *quickly*." These expressions are significant as to the period of the visions. The advent of Christ is announced to take place within a short time. One city is the theatre of sublime and terrible occurrences, Babylon built on seven hills,—Rome the representative of heathenism or antichristian idolatry. In this

catastrophe the judgment culminates, and the new Jerusalem succeeds. Historic personages of John's time appear in the book. Seven Roman emperors are alluded to; and one in particular. Unless the expositor adhere to the historic present and immediate future of the seer, he will lose himself in endless conjecture. Jewish ideas of Messiah's advent should be known; not less than Jewish-Christian ones. The prophet stood in the historical circumstances of his own time, and described the second advent in a series of dramatic visions which are ideal poetry. Eichhorn has erred to some extent in explaining this particular.

Secondly. It is a fundamental mistake to look for a detailed history of the Church, or of the leading events in the world's history that affect the Christian religion. Some find an epitome of the Church's history even in the epistles to the seven churches. Others find it in the remainder of the book; others in both together. Hence particular events are assigned to particular periods; persons are specified, peoples characterised, and definite names assigned. In this fashion the vicissitudes through which the Christian religion has passed in the world are sketched. The allegorising process by which the present scheme of interpretation is supported cannot be repudiated too strongly. The ablest advocates of it are Vitringa, Mede, Faber, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Auberlen, and Hofmann. It is inconsistent with the scope of the Apocalypse as well as the analogy of prophecy, and leads to arbitrary conjectures.

Thirdly. We should not look for a circumstance, event, person, or nation corresponding to the images of the seer. "All the particular traits in this large work," says Hug, "are by no means significant. Many are introduced only to enliven the representation, or are taken from the prophets and sacred books for the purpose of ornament; and no one who has any judgment in such matters will deny that the work is extraordinarily rich and gorgeous for a production of Western origin." This plain principle has been systematically violated by nearly all English commentators, including Elliott in particular. Thus, in explaining the language employed to describe the effect of the fifth angel-trumpet (ix. 1, &c.), the star fallen from heaven is pronounced to be Mohammed, by birth a star on the horizon of the political firmament, but a neglected orphan because his family had lost the keys of the Caaba. The secret cave of Hera, near Mecca, was the pit of the abyss, whence the pestilential fumes and darkness issued. *The key of the abyss* was given him, in allusive contrast to *the key of God* in the Koran. The locusts, to which the Saracens are compared, are peculiarly Arabic. The very name of the one suggests the other, both being similar in pronunciation and radicals: אֶרֶב (arbeh) and אֲרָבִי (arbi)!

Akin to this absurd process is the sense attached to the three frog-like spirits issuing out of the mouths of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet (xvi. 13); the first being democratic infidel lawlessness and rebellion; the second, popery; and the third, Oxford tractarianism! If the absurdity of this method needs farther exposure, the reader has only to look at the hypothesis respecting the two witnesses in the eleventh chapter, which Ebrard, reviving an old view, refers to *the law* and *the gospel*, and another has assumed to be the Son and the Spirit of God; whereas they are Elias and Moses, as the whole description shows. In like manner, the fourth vial being referred to the wars of the French Revolution, the words "power was given him to scorch men with fire" (xvi. 8) allude to Napoleon, who employed artillery to an extent beyond all former example in military annals, and inflicted fiery suffering both on his own nation and others. The men thus scorched "blasphemed the name of God, who had power over these plagues, and repented not to give him glory" (xvi. 9); which means, that the suffering nations during that fearful period (1789-1809) did not renounce the papal apostasy for a purer faith. The author of the New Testament in Greek and English (Mace), published 1729, makes *the tail* of the great red dragon to be Simon Magus. Another expositor tells us that the woman in the twelfth chapter "represents the covenant of redemption; and the child to be brought forth the righteousness provided by the covenant; that is, the destined means of counteracting the power of the legal accuser or avenger—the means of delivering the sinner from a yoke even worse than that of Egyptian bondage."

Fourthly. The principle of synchronism has been largely adopted by interpreters since the days of Mede and Vitringa, an explanation and defence of it being found in the *Clavis Apocalyptica* of the former. A scheme so ingenious has been followed by the majority of English expositors, especially by Faber. The same events, it is said, are represented by a succession of symbols, the symbols being varied, while the things they signify are the same. Instead of the book being continuously progressive, it is progressive and retrogressive throughout. The principle in question is connected with that interpretation which finds an epitome of history in the book, and stands or falls with it. The series of visions is progressive; but as the events which the seer depicts are nearly the same, the progression is not historical, but prophetic-ideal. It is rhetorical and poetical, not a description of successive events.

Fifthly. We cannot now enter into the designations of time occurring in the Apocalypse. Those who take a day for a year

have never established the truth of their opinion. In prophecy a day means a day, as elsewhere, unless the number be indefinite. This has been proved by Maitland, Stuart, and Davidson. Most numbers in the Revelation should not be taken arithmetically, but indefinitely. They are employed as part of the poetic costume, and are borrowed from the Old Testament.

Sixthly. In the thirteenth century that peculiar exegesis began which refers the book to heretics and sectaries in part. The Romish church set the example. Innocent III. in rousing up the crusade said that the Saracens were the true Antichrist, Mohammed the false prophet, and 666 years the duration of his power. As the church of Rome grew more corrupt, its opponents applied to it the descriptions of the book. The Pope was identified with Antichrist; and Rome papal with the great whore of Babylon. Since the Reformation, Protestants have usually found in the Revelation the papacy and its destruction. We need not say that the allusion is baseless. Protestant anti-papal exegesis has as much foundation as Rome's anti-heretic one. Signor Pastorini applies the sounding of the fifth trumpet (ix. 1-11) to the rise and progress of the Reformation. The star falling from heaven is Luther, who, renouncing his faith and vows, may be said to have fallen. When he opened the door of hell, there issued forth a thick smoke, or a strong spirit of seduction, which had been hatched in hell. A Protestant parallel to this is Elliott's application of the beast, in chapters xiii. and xvii., to the succession of popes.

The preceding remarks will show that the time for founding speculations about the end of the world and its final catastrophe on the book of Revelation, is past, because enlightened criticism has put to flight the dreams of designing or ignorant men respecting the destinies of nations and the future of the Church, avowedly based on unfulfilled prophecy. Credulity may still listen to the shallow preachers who wish to attract and astonish the multitude with their prophetic crudities; the superstitious may hang upon the lips of noisy declaimers, whose occupation in the region of the marvellous is profitable in proportion to its intrinsic worthlessness: but learning has cleared away the mists that long enveloped Daniel's visions and the Apocalyptic symbols. The dark drapery has been drawn aside from the mysterious pages, leaving their meaning patent to view; and if the professed instructors of the people will not perceive it, they must be abandoned to the companionship of their illiterate followers who delight to feed on empty husks. It is only the superstitious who are alarmed by predictions of coming catastrophes. The ignorant alone wonder at that pretended learning which unfolds the roll inscribed with the dark cha-

acters of future events. How long shall our prophecy-mongers flourish—the men who bring Scripture into contempt? When we see one dating the end of the world at a certain year, and hear another asserting with dogmatic absurdity, “I believe the sixty-six books of the Old and New Testaments to be verbally the word of God, as absolutely as were the ten commandments written by the finger of God on the two tables of stone,” we wonder that infidelity has not made more progress in this Protestant England.

ART. II.—FELIX MENDELSSOHN BARTHOLDY'S LETTERS.

Letters of F. Mendelssohn Bartholdy, from 1833-1847. Translated by Lady Wallace.

It was a judicious thought to place the likeness of Mendelssohn in death at the head of the last volume of his letters; for there is much in his feelings and his life alien to the flutter of the day, which that high and delicate countenance, calm but fervent, slightly sensuous perhaps, but refined and sad, helps to explain. With that face before us, it is more easy also to describe, without appearing to fall into sentiment, the connexion between the character of the man and his character as an artist and composer. Certain thoughts come more naturally by the side of a deathbed than at any other time,—thoughts friendly to art, and especially to music. Many persons are conscious of that susceptibility to art in them which is so touched at particular times by some poem, or picture, or piece of music, that they seem for a moment to have fallen under the spell of a personal revelation,—to have dreamt that all the jars and discordances of life were harmonised, the past reconciled with the future, and the present freed from every burden. Feelings which are casual in the many are almost the normal state of a very few, though seldom those which find vent in conversation. But death seems to have used a loving and delicate hand in painting upon Mendelssohn's face, in his last moments, that inner being which in his lifetime he had too much of the restraint of true feeling to lay entirely bare. There is, indeed, in that high and refined countenance, if not the wonted fire, the same candid grace and elevation, the same nobility and sincerity hostile to artifice, and, as in his music, the same flickering sense of a something too large, too indefinable, to grasp in the human hand, which were his known outward characteristics through life. But

over all, and as it were within the shadow of death itself which lies upon the face, there is another shadow,—the shadow of the internal feeling of a lifetime no longer guarded and confined, but caught at last outside the heart, and so expressed for ever; the shadow very gentle, very unrepining, but very perceptible, of an interrupted effort after something unattained; the shadow of all the toil rewarded by the pittance of achievement, of all the aspirations, all the dreams, all the visions of beauty half-seen only to evade and tantalise, of all the perfections imagined only to sadden and betray, of art cut short on the seeming threshold of fruition, and works scattered abroad to delight other men only to pall in their return on his own taste. "I only care," he said sadly once in the height of his popularity,—*"I only care for new compositions."*

But that expression, so plain and unmistakable, yet, as we have said, so unrepining, is even more touching when we look at it in connexion with his masculine sincerity and activity through life, his utter abhorrence of the cant of sentiment, which makes the society of musical amateurs so inexpressibly wearisome and odious to genuine musicians, his wholesome love of life for its own sake, his sincerity and industry, and, in the midst of his greatest worldly success, a simplicity of aims from which praise kept running off like water, leaving no impress on his nature:

"I cannot," he writes to his mother in 1837, "just now attempt to describe the Birmingham Musical Festival; it would require many sheets to do so. . . . One thing, however, I must tell you, because I know it will give you pleasure, which is, that I never had such brilliant success, and can never have any more unequivocal than at this festival. The applause and shouts at the least glimpse of me were incessant, and sometimes really made me laugh; for instance, they prevented my being able for long to sit down to the instrument to play a pianoforte concert; and what is better than all this applause, and a sure proof of my success, were the offers made to me on all sides, and of a very different tenor this time from what they ever were before."

But he adds immediately:

"I may well say that I now see, beyond doubt, that all this is only bestowed on me because, in the course of my work, I do not in the least concern myself as to what people wish, and praise and pay for, but solely as to what I consider good; so I shall now less than ever allow myself to be turned aside from my own path."

He is very indignant at the way in which the well-known composer, Chevalier Neukomm, was received on the same occasion at Birmingham:

"You know how highly they honoured, and really overvalued him formerly, and how much all his works were prized and sought after

here, so that the musicians used to call him the king of *Brummagem*; whereas on this occasion they neglected him shamefully,—a very striking proof of the value of all such things.”

And writing to Ferdinand Hiller on the same subject, he says:

“The only things that interest me are new compositions, and of these there is a great lack; often therefore I feel as if I should like to retire altogether, and not conduct any longer, but only write. . . . I felt just the same at Birmingham. I never made such a decided effect with my music as there, and never saw the public so much or so exclusively occupied with myself individually; and yet there is even in this something—what shall I call it?—fleeting and evanescent, which I find irksome and depressing, rather than cheering. Would there had not been an instance of the exact reverse of all these enthusiastic praises with regard to Neukomm, whom they on this occasion criticised so disdainfully, and set aside as completely, as three years ago they extolled him to the skies, when they placed him above all other composers, and applauded him at every step! Of what value, then, is their favour? You will, no doubt, say that Neukomm's music is not worth much; there we quite agree; but those who were formerly enchanted with it, and now give themselves such airs, don't know this. The whole thing made me feel most indignant; while Neukomm's calm and perfectly indifferent demeanour appeared to me the more admirable and dignified when contrasted with the others, and I like him better ever since this manly conduct.”

It may seem an easy thing to praise “the calm and perfectly indifferent demeanour” of the rival who is driven from the field. But even here the difference between a great and a small mind will appear. Mendelssohn could not help his own success honourably attained. He might have imitated those who trample on the rivals they supplant. Every day, and all around us, we see people who think it only natural and legitimate regard to their own interest to poison the well-springs and character of persons into whose shoes they have stepped. And artists especially are noted for their jealousies. But in nothing, perhaps, did Mendelssohn more truly represent the single-mindedness of art than in his radical dislike and contempt for the rivalries of his profession.

“Is not Guhr a most singular being?” he writes to his sister Fanny; “and yet I can get on better with him than with any other Frankfort musician. He enjoys life, and lives and lets live, but is sharp enough as a director, and beats common time so distinctly that they cannot fail to play to it, as if they were in arm-chairs; and my other colleagues here are so desperately melancholy, and always talking of musical critiques, and recognition, and flattering testimonials, and constantly fishing for compliments (*but these compliments must be genuine; they even aspire to outpourings of the heart!*). This is both provoking

and sad ; and yet (behind people's backs) they can play as mad pranks as any one. Much as I like Frankfort for a summer visit, I do not wish to be settled here as a musician, owing to all the above reasons, and many others besides."

There is something exquisitely comical in the aspirations of a knot of musicians, not to perfection in art, on their own parts, but "to genuine outpourings of the heart," on the part of the press. And this sly bit of humour from Mendelssohn is thoroughly in harmony with his general temper. Though ever striving after unattainable perfection in art, he was, in a worldly sense, a happy and contented man ; partly, no doubt, because he was successful, but chiefly because his standard was not of success in the world. Although never-ending pursuit and ceaseless movement, an artistic fever of motion, a yearning after something beyond, was the more essential character of the man, as it is of his music, he could not help laughing, with a mixture of pity, at the discontent and grumbling of smaller minds. His ideal of what art should be stood like the skies above their efforts and his. And working steadily with that ideal before him, he knew, when he had done his best, how little man could do, and he was spared the vulgarities of jealousy, as well as the vulgar joys of applause. And although he was, as every body knows, an eminently successful man,—in this country unboundedly successful,—it is plain that success seemed to him an accessory to his art, which might affect him physically,—as, indeed, it sometimes did so much as to overpower him,—but which never for a moment seemed to cloud his judgment or his vision. He was not like Beethoven, gloomy, morose, and capricious ; nor like Handel, capricious, haughty, and violent : his was essentially a loving, ardent nature. He loved quite simply the crowds that loved him ; but he loved something more, something equally above him and them, something that filled his life, his waking hours, his dreams, that beckoned him ever a little onward, but was ever beyond his grasp, until the overwrought frame gave way, and the tender-hearted man lay down almost in youth upon his deathbed, with the gentle shadow of the unattained upon his brow, leaving the crowds behind him, and closing his eyes on the one desired and uncompassed end of his otherwise successful life.

But to show how little the tenderness and idealism of Mendelssohn was allied to sentimentalism ; how simple, fresh, and masculine were the views of that delicate and almost feminine organisation ; how remote from mock modesty,—we quote part of a letter of his, written in 1846, on the performance of the *Elijah* at Birmingham :

"The rich full sounds of the orchestra and the huge organ com-

bined with the powerful choruses, who sang with honest enthusiasm; the wonderful resonance in the grand giant hall; an admirable English tenor singer; Staudigl, too, who took all possible pains, and whose talents and powers you already well know; and in addition a couple of excellent second soprano and contralto solo singers—all executing the music with peculiar spirit, and with the utmost fire and sympathy, doing justice not only to the loudest passages, but also to the softest *pianos*, in a manner which I never before heard from such masses; and, in addition, an impressionable, kindly, hushed, and enthusiastic audience,—all this is indeed sufficient good fortune for a first performance. In fact I never in my life heard a better, or I may say so good a one, and I almost doubt whether I shall ever again hear one equal to it, because there were so many favourable combinations on this occasion. Along, however, with so much light, as I before said, there were also shadows, and the worst was the soprano part. *It was all so neat, so pretty, so elegant, so slovenly, so devoid both of soul and head, that the music acquired a kind of amiable expression*, which even now almost drives me mad to think of it. The voice of the contralto, too, was not powerful enough to fill the hall, or to make itself heard beside such masses and such solo singers; but she sang exceedingly well and musically, and in that case the want of voice can be tolerated. At least to me, *nothing* is so repugnant in music as a certain cold, soulless coquetry, which is in itself so unmusical, and yet so often adopted as the basis of singing, and playing, and music of all kinds. It is singular that I find this to be the case *much less even with Italians than with us Germans*. It seems to me that our countrymen must either love music in all sincerity, or they display an odious, stupid, and affected coldness; while an Italian throat sings *just as it comes, in a straightforward way, though perhaps for money*,—but still not for the sake of money, and æsthetics, and criticism, and self-esteem, and the right school, and twenty-seven thousand other reasons, none of which really harmonise with their real nature. This struck me very forcibly at the musical festival. . . . Towards ten o'clock at night, when I was tired enough, the Italians lounged quietly in, with their usual cool *nonchalance*. But, from the very first moment that Grisi, Mario, and Lablache began to sing, I inwardly thanked God. They themselves know exactly what they intend, sing with purity and in time, and there is no mistaking where the first crotchet should come in."

If any amateurs, proud of their musical cant, and fondly fancying that they are invested with the sacred functions of the Apostolate of Art without imposition of hands, would realise how very ridiculous they are in the eyes of true artists, we invite them, in connexion with the simple-hearted, sensible view of musical matters taken by one of the most impressionable and enthusiastic of composers, to compare the following bombastic lines, sent by an amateur to Mendelssohn after the first performance of *Elijah*:

"To the noble artist, who, though encompassed by the Baal-worship of false art, by his genius and study has succeeded, like another

Elijah, in faithfully preserving the worship of true art; once more habituating the ear, amid the giddy whirl of empty, frivolous sound, to the pure tones of sympathetic feeling and legitimate harmony,—to the great master, who, by the tranquil current of his thoughts, reveals to us the gentle whisperings, as well as the mighty strife, of the elements,—to him is this written in grateful remembrance.”

Don Quixote himself could have written nothing much finer in his loftiest moods. It sounds like an address to the Queen from a low-church borough; and it is with a sly pleasure that the matter-of-fact reader pops behind the scene, and listens to Mendelssohn saying cheerily to a brother-composer :

“Thank you much for your advice about *Elijah*. You say the ‘Sanctus’ should be followed by the command of God to Elijah to resume his mission. The fact is, I had thought of having it so; and I think I will. But I cannot give up Elijah’s answer; and I think *both* can and ought to be there. But I cannot bring in Ahab again. The hardest bit of all was, after the ‘Still small voice,’ to find a conclusion for the whole broad enough (and yet not long),” &c. &c.

Not that he was in the least infected with the callous vulgarity with which certain artists treat their profession: “A young English tenor,” he writes to his brother, “sang the last air with such wonderful sweetness, that I was obliged to collect all my energies not to be affected, and to continue to beat time steadily.”

Writing to a friend at Lübeck, Mendelssohn raises the point, so much discussed, of the relative capability of expression of music and language. The passage is curious:

“People often complain that music is ambiguous; that their ideas on the subject always seem so vague; whereas every one understands words. With me it is exactly the reverse—not merely with regard to entire sentences, but also as to individual words: these too seem to me ambiguous; so vague, so unintelligible, when compared with genuine music, which fills the soul with a thousand things better than words. What the music I love expresses to me is not thought too *indefinite* to be put into words, but, on the contrary, too *definite*.”

Now although we cannot agree with a very accomplished scholar and musician, writing with a transparent pen upon this passage, “that this, in truth, is the root of the whole matter,” we think it a very true, though by no means so obvious a remark as it might seem, that “sound speaks thoughts as truly as a landscape or a flower is full of expression, or as the human countenance speaks, though no articulate sounds are uttered.” We should have preferred, however, the word “suggest” instead of “speaks.” Flowers *suggest* thoughts, and thoughts of all kinds, according to circumstances. Surely they *speak* thoughts only in the conventional language of flowers—where a rose says

one thing, and a lily another, by an arbitrary agreement among a certain number of persons. In this conventional sense, a rose no doubt *speaks* a *definite* thought. But the rose, as a rose in itself, and apart from such conventions, suggests a variety of thoughts and associations, which necessarily vary in each individual. In other words, the thoughts which a rose suggests are not *definite*, but *indefinite*. Of course, if it were meant that a rose is a rose and not a tulip, and that the rose leaves one impression on the eye and nose, and the tulip another,—in this sense of the identity of a thing with itself a rose is a very *definite* thing. And in this sense, so also is the major chord of C, as distinguished from the minor chord of D, perfectly *definite*. But it seems to us a confusion of thought to say, as Mendelssohn does, that “*genuine music, which fills the soul with a thousand things better than words,*” is therefore also more *definite* than words. A slap in the face, which puts a man into a furious passion, and “fills his soul with a thousand things,” would probably fill another soul with a thousand other things—the only similarity in the two cases being the slap in the face. The true distinction between language and music, so far as definiteness of meaning goes, appears to us to lie much deeper. The real analogue to the laws of harmony are the laws of colour. Colour, as such, has its arithmetical laws of harmony just as much as musical sound. But to the different prismatic combinations of colour by fixed law answering to chords in music, no meaning attaches, because no meaning has been attached; but inasmuch as certain *coloured objects*, which stand to harmony or prismatic colours in the same relation that noises do to music (such as a house, stone, tree), *have* been associated with certain corresponding sounds, and as these sounds—house, stone, tree—suggest their objects by common usage; they are therefore *definite* sounds,—sounds which evoke a definite image because it universally attaches to them,—but the sound “house” when uttered is not a musical sound any more than the colour of a house is an optical harmony. If either could be supposed to be resolved into certain component (sonorous or optical) harmonies, these would then cease to have a definite meaning, because no *definite* meaning has been attached to them. There is no foundation, therefore, for saying that music can have a *definite* meaning, since a definite meaning supposes a concurrent and joint definition on the part of a certain number of persons. It is quite another thing to say that some music is sad, some joyful, some arch and playful, some grave and solemn; and further that in proportion as the musical susceptibility is cultivated, so different strains of music will awaken different moods of feeling, which, according to the sequence of the music, will follow one another, and be plainly

distinguishable by the person who experiences them. And here we think we can explain the fundamental difference between poetry and music. Poetry by a succession of *definite images* awakens a succession of moods—the grave, gay, hopeful, sad, joyous, exultant; from fury, through crime, horror, and remorse,—from love, through hope, to despair, or triumph,—we are made to pass by a skilful gallery of illustration held up to our eyes by the poet.

Music does the converse—awakens a succession of *moods*, and leaves the mind of each person to supply the gallery of images. This theory, if true, has the advantage of solving many problems connected with the difference between poetry and music. Above all it explains thoroughly why, as a rule, music suits those people best, who are more sensuously and less intellectually disposed. Poetry demands a certain intellectual process before it can reach the feelings; and even then the particular images employed may fall coldly on certain minds, and thus fail to reach their feeling at all. Music goes straight to the well-spring of the particular mood represented, and makes no inconvenient call on the intellectual powers, leaving every mind to choose that drapery which his own experience naturally presents. Even when no drapery of fact does suggest itself, the feeling throbs in a tender dusk at ease, unhampered by inadequate definition. Hence, too, we can explain why the effect of music is more vehement than the effect of poetry. Whatever is addressed to the feelings through the intellect is always and necessarily more or less cooled in the process.

To reach a climax either in poetry or fiction, a long train must be laid, longer, more artful, and more intricate in proportion to the effect to be produced. Something of this is also true in music; but not nearly in the same degree. The very first phrase of some of Beethoven's or Mendelssohn's pieces opens all the portals and floodgates of emotion, as it were, by enchantment. And it is the property of the music of great masters to awaken the whole sequence of those vicissitudes and revolutions of feeling in a few minutes, which the greatest fictions can only hope to do after laborious perusal. In this sense it may be said, we think, with exact truth, that Music is the Algebra of Feeling as Language is the Algebra of Thought. Thus the educated musician, who listens to good music, experiences in the most condensed form those phases of feeling which he would feel if himself placed in any of the particular circumstances of which the music suggests the general type; his imagination not being balked, as in fiction, by the definite description of circumstances not exactly applicable to him, and which he has therefore to generalise before he can reapply them to his own case—always a frigid process.

If we are right in these remarks, they tend, we think, to show how it is that so many persons, including Mendelssohn, have come to think that music has a definite meaning. An algebraical formula is in one sense very definite, but not in another. If music were definite in the sense in which language is definite, then every musical phrase would have a definite meaning. To take only one example. Most musicians will recollect the wonderful ballad by Schubert, the "Erle King." Every phrase of the music is marvellously adapted to the corresponding words. Yet it would be a very bold assertion to say that any one of those phrases would be applicable only to the thought the words express. As somebody wittily said, if every thought has a corresponding musical phrase, what is the music for "Come to breakfast"?

Much has been said about classical music and music not classical; and a not uncommon impression in society seems to be, that classical music means unpleasant and hard music; and that if music is to be pleasant, it must at all events not be classical. Those who take this view, under every variety of apology and phraseology, are not, however, agreed in their application. One person will listen with evident delight to Blumenthal's sugary trifles, who ill conceals a yawn over an adagio of Beethoven, and will tell you, with proud humility, that he supposes it must be his bad taste, but he cannot enter into "classical" music. His neighbour will enter heart and soul, perhaps, into Beethoven, but will listen with forced attention to the finest fugue of Bach. And he, too, will be apt to fancy, unless he is a professed musician, that what he likes is not classical music, because he likes it; and that what he does not like, if he hears other people pronounce it to be very fine, must be classical music. Thus we have known persons who thought that *Don Giovanni* is not classical music, because it contains many pretty airs; but that Bach's *Passions Musik* is classical, because it does not. And the persons who judge in this, or in some similar, manner are perhaps a very considerable majority. Nor have we the slightest thought of laughing at their judgment. On the contrary, many of them take their ignorance to heart, or, as they consider it, their defective taste, with affecting simplicity. We wish to point out for their consolation that the difference between what is classical and not classical is of the same kind in music as it is in all the other arts, and in literature. No lady would be ashamed to own that she did not know the Latin or Greek Classics. In her case it would probably mean that she had not learnt Greek and Latin at all, and would argue no deficiency of organisation. Or again, if she did know a little Latin and Greek, it would be no sign of defective intellect if she was

still unable to point out what are the characteristics which distinguish the Classics, properly so called, from later Latin and Greek. But there is a further distinction to draw. Suppose a lady to know Latin just enough to read and even to enjoy Virgil, Plautus might still seem to her perfectly crabbed and unintelligible, in spite of his innumerable beauties and a freshness of feeling, by the side of which Virgil's varnished art may seem stiff and tawdry. And this distinction becomes even more salient if we take examples in our own language. Few girls in the present day—we were on the point of saying, few men—read Shakespeare, and still less Chaucer, with any thing like free, spontaneous, and genuine relish. Shakespeare, to the majority of the rising generation, is a sort of Beethoven in English literature, and Chaucer a species of Bach. They may *learn*, indeed, to love Shakespeare; and when they have *learnt* to love him may be affected by him with an intensity and depth, a variety of emotions, by the side of which what they would otherwise have thought the most harrowing pages or the most darling stanzas in the frippery of the day will seem utterly inane. But unless they learn it will not come by nature, any more than Greek or Latin; for by nature in any given generation we are only born upon a certain natural level, and if we wish to peep over into the kingdom of art, we must rise by art on tip-toe above the level of the day. How true this is may be seen judging even by strictly modern English works. We know educated persons, trained in modern languages, and who therefore have undergone a certain amount of mental discipline, who candidly confess that they find Tennyson's poetry decidedly hard reading. The futility of the doctrine, which declares that the highest art is that which is ratified by the voice of the multitude, is shown by the relative sale of Tupper, Longfellow, and Tennyson. As an artist Mr. Longfellow stands on an inaccessible height above Mr. Tupper, just as Mr. Tennyson stands on an inaccessible height above Mr. Longfellow; and the relative accessibility of their pinnacles in art is also the relative measure of their popularity. In all the arts there is the rudimentary taste and the educated taste. But it is not an uncommon mistake to call the "educated taste" an "*acquired taste*," in the sense of something purely capricious and arbitrary. How capricious and arbitrary some freaks of taste may be, we may gather from sundry self-constituted dictatorships in art. But apart from such exceptions, there is in every art a legitimate and organic development of taste, even where we cannot distinctly trace it,—a development which we see exemplified very naturally and forcibly in the every-day growth of an ordinary man's mind from childhood to maturity. To take an illustration from painting. As

in his early childhood probably the most vivid and startling effect produced upon his artistic sense, the first awakening and vibration of his artistic soul, arises on the first and miraculous sight of the blue, green, and red blaze of most delicious, intoxicating, and overwhelming colour in the chemist's shop (shall we ever forget that first most wonderful vision?), so by degrees his oriental phrensy and gorgeous gluttony of eye softens down into tender and timid worship of the pink-and-white barber's block, so soft and smooth, with the bold, large, soft, and mild blue or black eyes, as the case may be, and the hair such as the hair of mankind would be on earth (if barbers ruled on earth), and at all events must be in heaven, where all that is is perfect. Alas for the paradise of barbers! a change comes over his youthful dream; mere pink and white, and heavenly blue, and black unspeakable, begin to pall. He is conscious of more indefinable essences; and he bows down and worships before a Carlo Dolce, or, if of a more British and less transcendental turn, before the parting scene of Mr. Frith, that latest, fullest, and most subtle ideal of vulgarity in art. Or again perhaps, with the crowd, he stops at the Exhibition, and gazes with strange and curious awe at Delacroix's pea-green picture of the "Christian Martyr."

So far all is popular; and so far, though within popular limits, a naturally progressive and organic development of taste is apparent within the natural limits of an ordinary mind, unaided by exceptional organisation or special education. But we may go a step further in our illustration. Beneath the "Christian Martyr" many of our readers will remember three small pictures by the same painter, so brown, so dingy and unattractive, that not one person in a thousand, who held his breath as he looked at the halo round the floating girl's head, took the trouble to bestow more than a glance on them, and then only to pass on. These three pictures were, nevertheless, infinitely superior to that of the martyr—pictures, though small and insignificant-looking, of surprising depth, power, and pathos. One was the "Ascent of the Calvary," the second was the "Return from the Calvary," the third was the "Contemplation of the Crown of Thorns." Compared with those three tiny pictures, the "Christian Martyr," however respectable in itself, is a mere *ad captandum* effect, in which "sensation" is studied and exaggerated; while in them every vestige of sensation is excluded with the jealousy of absorbing feeling and of the purest art. The multitude showed the *average* progress of taste in admiring the one; the further progress of the artistic few was exemplified in their admiration of the others.

But if we dwell at such length upon illustrations derived,

not from music, but painting, it is because the difference between the relative classes of pictures is so very analogous, and places, so to speak, in such ocular* relief the real nature of the differences between different classes of music. One of the first musical critics of the day, whose splendid prose in the leading daily journal would adorn any subject, once forgot his well-known admiration for Bach's music so far as to call it the grammar of music. But he might as well say that Chaucer is the grammar of the English language, or Homer the grammar of the Greek

* It may seem an apparent solecism to compare the effect of music on the ear with effects produced upon the eye. Most musical readers may remember the pun said by Madame de Stael to have been current at Vienna, when Haydn's *Creation* was first performed, namely, that at the apparition of light people were compelled to stop their ears. But, in truth, if we go to the root of the matter, and enter upon ground which we admit to be no longer æsthetical, but metaphysical, the solecism is more apparent than real. The eye and the ear are indeed differently acted upon by light and sound, being differently constituted; but the effects produced upon them are referred to the same central feeling, which is equally affected by both, and the laws of which are therefore æsthetically—that is to say, in point of art—paramount over both. There is such a thing as a blaze of sound, as there is a blaze of light. Both light and sound are, in the last resort, only different modifications of similar vibratory causes, acting upon a homogeneous centre through different organs. Hence we see how close must be the interdependence between the artistic phases expressive of human feeling to the ear and the eye. Not indeed that the development of the æsthetical element in both is necessarily *contemporary*, for it is a curious fact that the greatest extension in music has taken place in times during which it seems agreed that the plastic arts, with whatever fluctuations, have rather declined. Perhaps this might be accounted for on the principle that, when the expenditure of plastic energy in the development of one set of arts—that is, of the arts dependent upon one organ—was at its height, it could not at the same time culminate in the other organ, though it might educate its sensibility by refining the whole nervous system. We may be thought fanciful, perhaps, but it seems to us that there is a very plain *à priori* explanation of the priority of sculpture and painting to music; it is, in fact, neither more nor less than the priority of the eye over the ear. The pleasures of the ear are more subjective, more dependent on repose, more feminine, and therefore of later maturity, than those of the eye. Music is the growth of a later stage of civilisation. If any thing strikes us more prominently than another in those vast Assyrian and Egyptian remains, it is the enormous and youthful, the absorbing and, so to speak, gluttonous, predominance of the external and objective,—that is to say of the *eye*. It almost seems as if, on the first awakening of the mental development beyond a purely stationary and rudimentary condition, man, like a falcon suddenly unhooded, had been swallowed up by the sight of his eyes, by the sense of space and size and colour; and as if all his imitative faculties had rushed into competition with this first revelation of the objective world. Thence down to the Greek statue, what a transition from the vision of an overwhelming universe to the comparative and scientific, the naked and exact realisation of himself! Here, however, we have only got to sculpture. Then follows painting, which, as compared with sculpture, is as subjective and almost "feminine" as music is in comparison with painting. Still, between painting and sculpture there is not a gulf as between both and music. Music in its effects is the awakening of an inner and unbounded world; whereas painting or sculpture never can be more than the external expression of thought, limited in extent, and chained in duration, to one point of time. But the artistic laws which govern both are derived from the same central fountain-head of human emotion. Hence the higher and interpretative canons of æsthetical criticism, applicable to one, are generally, *mutatis mutandis*, applicable to the other.

tongue. There are sonatas of Bach, for sublimity and pathos, for depth, tenderness, and the wonderful, crisp variety of the emotions which they touch in their extraordinary fulness and richness, in comparison with which the most sentimental music of the day sounds thin and poor and meaningless.

Compared with the manifold depth, tenderness, and sublimity of some of Bach's adagios and andantes, much even of Handel's music bears somewhat the same relation to them as a military picture does to a "Descent from the Cross." We do not in the least quarrel with those who prefer Verdi's *Trovatore*, or the *Huguenots* of Meyerbeer, to Bach's fugues, any more than we quarrel with the ninety-nine persons who preferred the "Christian Martyr" to the "Contemplation of the Crown of Thorns." It is possible to enjoy, and we are not of the fanatics who cannot enjoy, different schools of music as well as different schools of painting. But what we wish to place in the strongest relief is the essential analogy of the distinctions between different composers and those which exist between painters and ages of painting, not merely in relation of degrees of excellence, but in the relation of one kind and style to another. Persons, therefore, without corresponding education in music need no more wonder that they cannot enter into the finest kinds of music, than that they do not know the true differences between a plausible painting and a genuine masterpiece. As in painting there are masterpieces large enough to cover a side of a room, and others no bigger than a sheet of foolscap, in which the genius of the master and the height of his art are equally apparent to the practised eye, so in music, however enchanting a good opera, or however striking and impressive an oratorio may be, there are sonatas and fugues and studies, in which the proportions of the composer's genius are equally palpable and delightful to the genuine musician. And these remarks are addressed both to those who, because they fancy that it is a slur upon them not to care for certain kinds of music, too often go on, as it were in self-defence, to underrate them; and to those who think that music is after all but a pleasant mode of caressing and soothing the senses with a jingle of agreeable sounds, and that it does not admit of that subordination and interdependence of parts in an organic whole, and of the relation of that whole to all the intricacies of human feeling, which constitute an art properly so called; whereas in truth we contend that music reaches all the feelings which are touched by painting and poetry—the sense of beauty, admiration, horror, and the like; but further that in addition to this, in all ordinarily musical natures, it awakens a maze of feelings, a peculiar world of emotions, and raises, though we dislike the French idiom, what we can only call unlimited horizons of

internal vision, compared with which the effect of the finest painting in the world is a pale, cold, measured, intellectual process. And on this point it is remarkable that Goethe, who intellectually seemed to have glimpses of every thing, saw this property of music, and applied it with such marvellous effect in *Faust*, although in point of fact he himself was not musically inclined. Nor can it be denied that there is often an apparent antagonism between the musical and the intellectual capacity. The musical nature is inclined to be a dreamy nature, a nature turned inwards; and though we think that a good musician will rarely be a really stupid man, he may seem to be so, from an original disinclination to give up the warmer train of musical feeling for the colder field of intellectual processes. His whole nature becomes absorbed in a rhythmical life. A musical friend, whose only passion in life was music, and who was often thought stupid and morose by those who did not know him, once confided to us, that at one time in his life he was never a moment in the day without musical trains of feeling rolling backwards and forwards; and his pleasure was to take his stick and roam over the country, letting his musical sense go its own gait. Nor would he walk with a companion, hating to have his pleasure disturbed. The expression of his countenance was generally morose, heavy, and clouded,—though in reality he was a sweet-tempered man,—and never so clouded as at the very moments when he was most absorbed by his internal pleasures. The reason of this seems sufficiently obvious. When the faculties are concentrated upon inward feelings, without reference to external objects, the tension and brightness of expression due to attention to outer objects and external expectancy disappears. Hence great talkers, who as a rule are not fond of music, have bright busy looks, and musical people, on the contrary, are apt to find talking an effort and a bore; talking to them is much what paddling awkwardly in the mud is to an eagle. As a rule, we should say that musicians have often a scientific, and sometimes a poetical, but rarely a political, organisation. But the military and the musical natures, for some reason, have a secret affinity. Few military men are without a musical sense of some sort. Mathematicians are also often fond of music; classical scholars rarely, and politicians least of all.

If, turning from this more abstract discussion, we endeavour to define the place of Mendelssohn among modern musicians, we shall perhaps not be far wrong in saying, that of the numerous progeny of the school of Sebastian Bach, he is the composer, who, with an unmistakable stamp and character of his own, has combined the most eclectic tendencies. Mendelssohn was essentially a learned musician, whose every fibre was first of all soaked

through and through with Bach, the object of his fervent adoration, and he was never weary moreover of ransacking the musical libraries of Europe, hunting up old manuscripts with the zeal of an antiquarian, and going into ecstasies of delight if a sympathetic friend introduced him to some new parchment of some forgotten composer. Yet it would be impossible to accuse him of plagiarism, for every bar of his music is as unmistakably marked with his own seal as if the same or a similar combination had never occurred to any other writer. No man was less likely to fall into the absurd cant of what is called the "music of the future." His whole temper was alien to the very idea. But it is easy to see how strongly he was influenced by the modern spirit, and how the vague and dreamy element, the restless and troubled spirit arising out of the rush and turmoil of modern life, worked upon his naturally ardent mind, and every where peeped out of his music, even through the classical and scientific forms with which his studies had supplied him. If we were asked in one word to define the pervading characteristic of Mendelssohn's music, we should say, "movement." And by movement we do not of course mean rapidity of execution,—although many of his allegros are remarkable for their headlong impetuosity, as it were, their tumultuous rush (as of cataracts in motion), and although many friendly critics objected to the tremendous pace at which he always took his own music,—but, as it seems to us, even in his slow movements there is always a suggestive, prospective, and anticipatory effect, as if arising out of a sigh of expectation for something longed for and looked forward to. And in this he differs in a very marked degree from the older classical composers, who seem, in working out a theme, to be dwelling emphatically upon something in the past, building up everlasting temples of silvery sound to foregone and blessed memories, rather than hastening towards something ever beyond. Hence too, and branching out of the same characteristic, arises, we think, Mendelssohn's great success in scherzos and fairy music of all sorts; which are, in fact, the very poetry of motion and unrest.

Handel, when he painted the motion of a crowd, painted it, like a great historical painter, as in the past. We see the beginning and the end. The frame of the picture is laid, and the details worked out; but there is not the vestige of a yearning on the part of the composer towards a something beyond him, towards which he is unconsciously striving. In Handel's music, the song of the singers and the shout of the crowds, however tender and sublime, or august and magnificent, are things of the past; it is, according to Handel, how they sang and shouted, if they sang and shouted at all: it is not Handel's own yearning in other men's mouths. But in all that Men-

delssohn wrote, we do not know a bar which does not seem to be the intimate expression of the composer's own aspirations. And as he was a great master of classical, that is to say, abiding forms, it is this embodiment of the strictly modern anxious spirit, in a permanent mould, which to our minds constitutes the great charm of his music. There is also a peculiarity and richness of colour in his compositions, due to his studied instrumentation, which many critics have thought, especially in his younger days, excessive. This he toned down as he grew older; but in all stages it was as distinctively Mendelssohnian—always remembering the common fountain-head from which he, no less than Beethoven, Mozart, and Schumann, drew his materials—as Thackeray's etchings were peculiar to Thackeray.

Mendelssohn's appreciation of other artists was magnanimous and cordial, and not less his delicacy towards inferior musicians. The following anecdote in a letter written by him to his sister, Mrs. Dirichlet, throws a pleasing light on this side of his character:

"Previous to that Sunday" (he is writing from Düsseldorf in 1833) "there was rather a touching scene. I must tell you that really no appropriate epithet exists for the music which has been hitherto given here. The chaplain came and complained to me of his dilemma; the burgomaster had said that though his predecessor was evangelical, and perfectly satisfied with the music, he intended himself to form part of the procession, and insisted that the music should be of a better class. A very crabbed old musician, in a threadbare coat, was summoned, whose office it had hitherto been to beat time. When he came, and they attacked him, he declared that he neither could nor would have better music; if any improvement was required, some one else must be employed; that he knew perfectly what vast pretensions some people made nowadays, *every thing was expected to sound so beautiful: this had not been the case in his day, and he played just as well now as formerly.*"

There is something wonderfully lifelike and German and quaint about the scene. The sturdy opposition of the old musical Tory, and his unanswerable sarcasm, that every thing was expected to sound so beautiful nowadays!

"I was really very reluctant," Mendelssohn continues, "to take the affair out of his hands, though there could be no doubt that others would do infinitely better."

What follows is manly and touching:

"I could not help thinking how I should myself feel, were I to be summoned some fifty years hence to a town-hall, and spoken to in this strain, and a young greenhorn snubbed me, and my coat were seedy, and I had not the most remote idea why the music should be better; and . . . I felt rather uncomfortable."

This is a type of many an idyll in all professions. As Mr. Thackeray would have said in his pathetic way: "Young men, take off your hats to the gray-headed ensign. There is no telling which of you may not be a gray-headed ensign one of these days."

Mendelssohn's opinion of Liszt and Thalberg is of the utmost interest, so perfectly unprepossessed, warm, unaffected, and sincere,—a model of rival criticism:

"The turmoil of the last few weeks was overpowering" (he writes from Leipzig to his mother). "Liszt was here for a fortnight, and caused quite a paroxysm of excitement among us, both in a good and evil sense. I consider him to be in reality an amiable and warm-hearted man, and an admirable artist. That he plays with more execution than all the others, does not admit of a doubt. Yet Thalberg, with his composure, and within his more restricted sphere, is more perfect taken as a *virtuoso*;* and this is the standard which must also be applied to Liszt, for his compositions are inferior to his playing, and, in fact, are only calculated for virtuosos. A fantasia by Thalberg (especially that on the *Donna del Lago*) is an accumulation of the most exquisite and delicate effects, and a continued succession of difficulties and embellishments that excite our astonishment; all is so well devised and so finished, carried out with such security and skill, and pervaded by the most refined taste."

Here again we may observe that a similar distinction holds in musical *execution* and general mechanical effect, which obtains in painting. There is in music a grandeur of *execution* and interpretation, and a masculine tone of expression, compatible at the same time with the utmost pathos and refinement in art, which bears the same relation to the Thalberg and Blumenthal polish, however delicious, which we find between a Rembrandt or Titian on one hand and Sèvres china on the other.

But this by the way. Mendelssohn continues:

"Liszt possesses a degree of velocity and complete independence of finger, and a thoroughly musical feeling, which can scarcely be equalled. In a word, I have heard no performer whose musical perceptions, like those of Liszt, extended to the very tips of his fingers, *emanating directly from them*."

A severe sarcasm from the gentle Mendelssohn; but he is not dreaming of depreciation,—he is trying with the utmost simplicity to tell his mother the exact impression left upon his mind by Liszt's playing.

* A well-known technical term among musicians denoting the highest class of mechanical executant, as distinguished from a composer on the one hand, and the "interpreter" of classical music, properly so called, on the other. In the present day, when musical training is carried to such perfection, almost every professional musician who has any claim to appear alone before a London audience may be roughly classed as a *virtuoso* in execution. But every *virtuoso* is not also necessarily a classical musician.

"With this power, and his enormous technicality and practice, he must have far surpassed all others, if a man's own ideas were not after all the chief point, and these, hitherto at least, seem denied to him ; so that in this phase of art, most of the great virtuosos equal, and indeed excel, him. But that he, along with Thalberg, *alone* represents the highest class of pianists of the present day is, I think, undeniable."

Mendelssohn has in this passage touched, as he could hardly help touching, upon the curious question, why the greatest executants in music, as a matter of fact, are never the greatest composers, and great composers rarely (if ever) the greatest executants. So true is this as a fact, that in some measure it might almost be pronounced beforehand, that whoever attained first-rate eminence in one department would not obtain the first rank in the other. We think the question admits of at least a probable answer. The faculty required for a first-rate executant is a great delicacy of perception as to the perfection of any one idea ; a tenacity in retaining that idea and *keeping it on the mind* in vital operation, without palling on the feelings, until the fingers, more distant from the seat of empire, and therefore less sensitive, are nevertheless brought into perfect unison with the central feeling. But this requires a peculiar constitution of the fibre—great delicacy, and yet withal at the same time a certain bluntness to save the fibre from being worn out, consumed as it were, by the constant repetition required for mechanical perfection. Thus, to be able to practise an instrument until it seems to be transformed into an integral part of the living organisation, without blunting the musical relish in the thing practised, necessitates a certain passive power of reception which seems hostile to spontaneity of ideas. On the other hand, a great tendency in the imagination to new ideas supposes a less tenacious and more mutable fibre—one in which ideas once conceived become mere transition links to other ideas, fading away themselves, and, as it were, consuming the ground behind them. It is a curious confirmation of this theory, that Mendelssohn, who in so high a degree united both capacities, was by nature, if we may use the expression, a learned rather than a purely creative musician. Whatever he took, he indeed made peculiarly his own, stamping it with his own seal henceforward, but underlying this transforming faculty lay a radical eclecticism. Another significant and melancholy confirmation of our theory is that, like Mozart, whom in so many respects he resembled, he died young.

Soon after the Düsseldorf episode, we find Mendelssohn engaged heart and soul in carrying out one of the dreams of his life, and that was the foundation of a school of music at Leipzig.

"The positive, technical, and material tendencies so prevalent at the present day," he writes, "render the preservation of a genuine

sense of art, and its further advancement, of twofold importance, but also of twofold difficulty. A solid basis alone can accomplish this purpose" (he is pleading for a royal grant); "and as the extension of sound instruction is the best mode of promoting every species of moral improvement, so it is with music also. . . . Mere private instruction, which once bore much good fruit for the world at large, on many accounts now no longer suffices. Formerly, students of various instruments were to be found in every class of society, whereas now this amateurship is gradually passing away, or is chiefly confined to one instrument—the piano."

It would be a curious inquiry to discover whether the proportionate number of amateurs is now less than it used to be. In England it is certain that the number of families in which the girls are taught to play or sing, merely as a matter of course, as naturally as they are taught dancing, is surprisingly large, and, we believe, very much greater than it is abroad. On the other hand, the appreciation of music abroad is so much finer, that, as a rule, no lady would dream of sitting down to the piano unless she could play in such a way as to command attention, attention which is immediately given abroad as a matter of strict courtesy. In England, Emily and Susan and Harriett and Jane sit down and play to any number of strangers, as a matter of course, whether they can or whether they can't. This state of things we are persuaded will not continue very long, owing to the growing familiarity with first-rate music, which is gradually and swiftly spreading throughout the country. But the fact remains, that in England the number of lady-amateurs is probably a hundred per cent greater than it was in the last generation. But do men cultivate music as much as they did? This is a question which seems hard to answer. If the number has increased, it has not, we believe, increased in any thing like the same proportion as on the female side of the community. At the public schools and Universities, indeed, among the rising generation there is a large and perceptible increase in the number of youths who take to music.

It is, however, a symptom not a little curious of the change in the manners of the day, that they mostly learn the piano instead of stringed or other instruments. Some people complain of this as a sign of growing effeminacy; we really cannot view it in that light. Among all his antagonists, Napoleon, we are told, gave the first place to Archduke Charles, both in character and military genius; and Archduke Charles was devoted to his piano. Few glimpses into the great wars which ushered in this century are more delicate and touching than that of the pallid, frail, and rather melancholy, but heroic and dauntless, Austrian prince, the only contemporary strategist who extorted the admiration of the greatest general in the world, sitting at his

piano in the intrenched camp at Ulm. Even so small an incident might be looked upon by an imaginative mind as not inaptly betokening the growing spirit of refinement which is, perhaps, the most salient characteristic of our century, and ought to suggest some useful reflections to those who measure greatness of mind by girth of muscle, and intellectual power by steam-engine bustle. Muscle and steam and physical insensibility are very fine and valuable things, but they are not the finest things.

In connexion with Mendelssohn's ardent desire to found a school of music at Leipzig, we have heard an anecdote on the best authority, which brings out Mendelssohn's essential nobility, and which deserves to be recorded. In the very early days of that school, Joseph Joachim, now the first musical artist of the day, then only nine years old, was sent from Hungary by his parents to the great composer to study under his care. It is well known that when he was only thirteen Joachim created a great sensation in London, but it seems that at nine he was already a very considerable player; so considerable, that to have been able to announce him as one of the pupils of the Leipzig school, would have been of very great service to the growth of the institution. But Mendelssohn told him that he was too far advanced to enter the school, and took the young boy, a perfect stranger to him, into his own house, and treated him like a son thenceforward. This is one of those actions which prove that the seat of true greatness of action lies in the heart, which is also the fountain-head of every thing great in the arts. And in Mendelssohn's life there is the peculiar charm which belongs to music itself, that of a perfect harmony in all its parts. We never remember to have heard or read of any thing to his disparagement: there is nothing mean, nothing sordid, nothing dishonourable; no treacherous act or word of his on record, no slanderous attack upon his rivals behind their backs; but the whole tenor of his life seems to have been equally noble, and his goodness equally remote from every thing pedantic, priggish, or affected.

How simple and playful was his love of life, and how wholesome his feelings in their utmost activity, we see almost in every page of his letters. On his travels he kept a diary, to which he refers for the sake of giving some hints to his sister, Fanny Hensel, before her journey to Italy. He tells her when she gets to Naples to be sure and "eat as a salad broccoli and ham; and write to me if it is not capital." At Venice she is to compose something in honour of Giorgione's "Cithern Player;" for "I did so." "If you don't think of me at the sight of the golden glory of the sky behind Mary,—then there is an end of all things!" "Likewise two cherubs' heads, from which an ox might learn what true beauty is." (Probably the ox, we think, would say that the cherubs are very well as a picture of glorified

human babies; but that it was only the limited faculties of the human Mendelssohn which prevented him from seeing that real cherubs should be painted as calves.) "If the 'Presentation of Mary,' and the woman selling eggs underneath, do not please you, then call me a blockhead." The following passage is really curious, as showing a musician's view of the characteristics of some of the great painters.

"*Florence.*—The following are among my notes on the portrait-gallery (see if you find them true, and write to me on the subject): 'Comparison between the head and its production, between the man's work and his exterior—the artist and his portrait. Titian, vigorous and royal; Domenichino, precise, bright, very astute, and buoyant; Guido, pale, dignified, masterly, keen; Lanfranco, a grotesque mask; Leonello Spada, a good-natured *fanfaron* and a reveller; Annibale Caracci, peeping and prying; the two Caraccis like the members of a guild; Caravaggio, rather commonplace and cat-like; Guercino, handsome and affected, melancholy and dark; Bellini the red-haired, the stern old-fashioned teacher; Giorgione, chivalrous, fantastic, serene, and clear; Leonardo da Vinci, the lion; in the middle, the fragile, heavenly Raphael; and over him Michael Angelo, ugly, vigorous, malignant; Carlo Dolce, a coxcomb; Gerard Dow, a mere *appendage among his kitchen-utensils*,' &c. &c.

There is singular force and penetration in many of these descriptions. We do not remember to have seen the picture of Michael Angelo. We should not have imagined him ugly, but rather of a rough, masculine sort of beauty, and with a kind of supernatural power.

Lavater says somewhere that "humility is but the knowledge of the truth." And of that humility which neither extenuates nor extols aught in self, but takes a calm survey of it as it is, these letters offer a striking example. The late king of Prussia, whose classical tastes are well known, had set his heart upon having Æschylus's trilogy of the Agamemnon, Choëphoræ, and Eumenides "combined, curtailed, and put to music;" and he decided in his own mind that Mendelssohn should be the composer. He made certain overtures to Mendelssohn on the subject in conversation; but whether he expressed the whole of his plan seems uncertain. The king said he did, and that Mendelssohn had accepted the task. Mendelssohn, however, declared the king had only mentioned the Eumenides, but had never spoken of a combined and curtailed trilogy. Be this as it may, many a composer, if he had the learning and capacity of Mendelssohn, would have jumped at the offer, and written music of some kind or other to meet the royal views. Not Mendelssohn. He was perfectly willing, and would have been perfectly happy to oblige his æsthetical majesty, provided he could satisfy

his own standard of taste ; but, whether he was mistaken or not in the matter, he could not satisfy himself that he would accomplish the task to his own satisfaction, and he declined the honour of pleasing his majesty.

The correspondence on the subject is characteristic :

"To Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, from the Geheim Cabinetsrath Müller.

Berlin, March 5th, 1845.

It is proposed to set to music the choruses of the trilogy of the Agamemnon, Choëphoræ, and Eumenides, to be combined and curtailed for performance. According to Tieck's information, you declined the composition in this form. *The king can scarcely believe this* [kings are very slow to believe that their wishes can be declined], as his majesty distinctly remembers that you, esteemed sir, personally assured him that you were prepared to undertake this composition. I am therefore commissioned by the king to ask, whether the affair may not be considered settled by your verbal assent ; and whether, in pursuance of this, you feel disposed to be so kind as to declare your readiness to undertake the composition, which will be a source of much pleasure to the king, and *in accordance with your promise gladly to comply with any wishes of his majesty.*

I am, sir, your obedient

MÜLLER."

There is a glib, smooth arrogance in the tone of the Prussian court-official, which is the very quintessence of the divine right of German kings to crowns, music, earth, sea, skies, and all that in them is, reflected with compound vulgarity in the king's own flunkeys. Mendelssohn's letter is the perfection of simple dignity :

"To Geheim Cabinetsrath Müller, Berlin.

Frankfort, March 12th, 1845.

His majesty the king *never spoke to me* on the subject of the choruses in the combined and curtailed trilogy of the Agamemnon, Choëphoræ, and Eumenides. His majesty certainly was pleased to appoint me the task last winter of composing music for the choruses in Æschylus's Eumenides. I could not promise to supply even this music, because I at once saw that the *undertaking was beyond my capabilities* ; still, I promised his majesty to make the attempt, not concealing at the same time the almost insuperable difficulties which caused me to doubt the success of the attempt.

Since then I have occupied myself for a considerable time, in the most earnest manner, with the tragedy. I have endeavoured, by every means in my power, to extract a musical sense from these choruses, in order to render them suitable for composition ; but I have not succeeded, and have only been enabled to fulfil the task in the case of one of them, in such a manner as is demanded by the loftiness of

the subject, and the refined artistic perceptions of the king. *Of course the question was not that of writing tolerably suitable music for the choruses, such as any composer conversant with the forms of art could write for almost every word*; but the injunction was to create, for the Æschylus choruses, music in the good and scientific style of the present day, which should express their meaning with life and reality. I have endeavoured to do this in my music to 'Antigone' with the Sophocles choruses; with regard, however, to the Æschylus choruses, in spite of all my strenuous efforts, I have not hitherto succeeded even in any one attempt."

But he was far above any affectation of insolent independence; and having simply stated the facts as he saw them, in answer to the fussy, florid impudence of "Cabinets-geheimrath," he goes on to say, "I always consider the fulfilment of his majesty's commands as a duty and a pleasure, so long as I can entertain any hope of performing the task worthily; and when I allow even one to remain unfulfilled, it arises solely from want of ability, and never from want of intention."

His letters to his mother were very long and affectionate. The parental tie, and indeed all ties but the conjugal tie, are stronger abroad than in England. But in England a marked change is perceptible in the rising generation. Mothers have asserted their right to a much larger share in the education of their boys, who are more in the drawing-room and less in the stable than they were fifty years ago. And this is no doubt partly a cause and partly an effect of the growing refinement in the habits of the upper classes. It is no longer thought to be a necessary proof of effeminacy in a boy to be devoted to his mother; and many a long letter goes home week after week from the public schools, full of affectionate details about boyish doings, which, a generation back, would have been received with coarse merriment or surprise. So great and universal is the change in this respect, that one is apt to wonder sometimes what the ultimate result of it all will be. Certainly the affection which so often binds the members of foreign families together is not the least agreeable feature of Continental life. To return to Mendelssohn, we quote a large part of a letter written to his mother from Frankfort in 1839:

"DEAR MOTHER,—We are leading the most agreeable, happy life imaginable here. I am therefore resolved not to go away till obliged to do so, and to give myself up entirely for the present to a sense of comfort and pleasure. The most delightful thing I ever saw in society was a fête in the forest here; I really must tell you all about it, because it was unique of its kind. Within a quarter of an hour's drive from the road, deep in the forest, where lofty spreading beech-trees stand in solitary grandeur, forming an impenetrable canopy above, and

where all around nothing was to be seen but green foliage glistening through innumerable trunks of trees,—this was the locality. We made our way through the thick underwood by a narrow footpath to the spot, where, on arriving, a number of white figures were visible in the distance, under a group of trees, encircled with massive garlands of flowers, which formed the concert-room. How lovely the voices sounded, and how brilliantly the soprano tones vibrated in the air! what charm and melting sweetness pervaded every strain! All was so still and retired, and yet so bright! *I had formed no conception of such an effect.* The choir consisted of about twenty good voices; during the previous rehearsal in a room, there had been some deficiencies and want of steadiness. Towards evening, however, when they stood under the trees, and uplifting their voices, gave the first song, 'Ihr Vöglein in den Zweigen schwank,' it was so enchanting in the silence of the woods, that it almost brought tears to my eyes. *It sounded like genuine poetry.* [The italics are ours. But it is a curious expression, showing how, in Mendelssohn's mind, unconsciously the highest aspiration of music was to *be poetry.*] The scene too was beautiful; all the pretty female figures in white, and Herr B—standing in the centre, beating time in his shirt-sleeves, and the audience seated on camp-stools or hampers, or lying on the moss. They sang through the whole book, and then three new songs which I had composed for the occasion. The third, 'Lerchengesang,' was rather exultingly shouted than sung, and repeated three times; while in the interim strawberries, cherries, and oranges were served on the most delicate china, and quantities of ice and wine and raspberry-syrup carried round. People were emerging in every direction out of the thicket, attracted from a distance by the sound of the music, *and they stretched themselves on the ground and listened.*

As it grew dark, great lanterns and torches were set up in the middle of the choir, and they sang songs by Schelble, and Hiller, and Schnyder, and Weber. Presently a large table, profusely decorated with flowers and brilliantly lighted, was brought forward, on which was an excellent supper, with all sorts of good dishes [salad of broccoli and ham, for instance?] and wines; while the stillness of the night, the loneliness of the wood (the nearest house being at least an hour's distance off), and the gigantic trunks of the trees frowning every moment more darkly and sternly in the gloom, lent a strange magic to the joyful clatter of the people under their branches. After supper they began again with the first song, and sang through the whole six, and then the three new ones, and the 'Lerchengesang' once more three times over. At length it was time to go; we met the wagon in the wood in which all the china and plate was to be taken back to the town; it could not stir from the spot, nor could we; but we contrived to get on at last, and arrived about midnight at our homes in Frankfort. The donors of the fête were detained in the forest till two o'clock, packing up every thing, and lost their way along with the large wagon, finding themselves unexpectedly at Isenburg; so they did not get home till long afterwards. There were three families who had the merit of this idea, and

whom we have to thank for this memorable fête. Two of these we were not at all acquainted with, and the third only slightly. *I know now how songs ought to sound in the open air, and hope shortly to compose a gay book of them.*"

Well, England may boast her factories and her valiant sons of toil, and a very noble boast it is in behalf of the human race, only a few years ahead—scarcely even that—of famine on its track. But so far as life for its own sake, and the pleasures of existence are concerned, they understand these things abroad better than we do. We may see also, in the description given by Mendelssohn, the immense part which climate plays in the evolution of the higher forms of music. Too much frost nips it in the bud: it is scorched by too much heat. That the English organisation is fundamentally musical, we know by the musical germs perceptible in our ballads, and by the enthusiastic cultivation of music under every disadvantage by our northern mechanics. Few things, to our mind, are more touching in our national life than the musical enthusiasm of the grimy English operative in the north, and the devotion with which he repays the labours of such men as Mr. Hallé. But if the musical instinct is strong in the English nature, it has not been strong enough to overcome the wet blanket of our climate. Music has remained an exotic, imprisoned in hot rooms and in theatres reeking with gas and other impurities. Hence it is that, with all the pains we take to transplant the musical productions of other countries to our soil, they live an artificial life, bearing no fruit, or leaving a few sickly shoots behind them to wither and die in the fog. The utmost we can do is to rise to the enjoyment of the dried fruits of other countries which we cannot produce at home. We may drink the wine: we cannot grow the grape.

In another letter from Leipzig to his mother, Mendelssohn says:

"It is quite too lovely here, and every hour of my new domestic life is like a festival; whereas in England, notwithstanding all its honours and pleasures, I had not one single moment of real heartfelt enjoyment; but now every day brings only a succession of joy and happiness; I once more know what it is to prize life."

To Ferdinand Hiller, writing about the same date with the confiding affection of a boy rather than with the reserve of a man of a European reputation, he says:

"Do you wish to know whether I like this [his position at Leipzig] as much as ever? When I am living as a married man in a pretty, new, comfortable house, with a fine view over gardens and fields and the towers of the city, and feel so comfortable and happy, so glad and

so peaceful, as I have never done since I quitted the parental roof,—when, in addition to this, I have good means, and goodwill on every side, I ask you how I can be otherwise than happy?”

He had all the conditions of perfect happiness—all but one, the perfect realisation of his ideal of art :

“There are many days, however,” he adds, “when I think it would be best after all to have no fixed situation. Directing so perpetually during two such months takes more out of me than the two years when I was composing all day long. I can scarcely ever compose here in winter ; and when I ask myself, after the greatest excitement, what has really occurred, it is in fact scarcely worth naming ; at least, it does not interest me much whether the acknowledged good works are given a degree oftener or a degree better, or not. The only things that interest me are new compositions, and of these there is a great lack ; often, therefore, I feel as if I should like to retire altogether, and not conduct any longer, but only write.”

But our space forbids us to follow the loving and large-hearted composer any further. Our object in this article has not been in any sense to give even a fragmentary account of Mendelssohn's life and career, but rather, on introducing Lady Wallace's masculine translation of the last volume of his letters, to offer such remarks as the perusal of some of the letters might suggest. A *Life of Mendelssohn* by a competent person would be an interesting, might be a most delightful and instructive, work. The letters which have now been published bring us down to within a very few days of his death. He wrote so fully, so freely, and confidently to his relations and friends, that we are able to form a very fair estimate of almost every opinion he held ; and as he was a cultivated man, with a keen perception of art, even in other fields than his own,—a man of unaffected piety, though of equally unaffected contempt for theology, and, in all the more subtle lines of feeling, essentially a gentleman,—one, too, who had seen European society on the largest scale,—his life, if properly written, might prove a useful contribution to the history and encouragement of modern art. Let us add that a compilation would be useless. No mere compilation would be looked at by the side of the letters which we already possess in a sufficiently readable English form.

ART. III.—THE PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLIES OF FRANCE.

Les Assemblées Provinciales sous Louis XVI. Par M. Léonce de Lavergne. Paris: Michel Lévy.

IF gospel warrant were needed for the complement of the philosophy of history, we could hardly take a better text than that which protests so clearly and forcibly against the hasty application of moral theories to events. "Or those eighteen upon whom the tower of Siloam fell and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwell in Jerusalem?" The belief that crime and ruin are connected is apt to blind us to the fact that they are connected only in an order that is above time and place, and that the son often bears the heavier burdens of disease, bankruptcy, or moral disgrace which the father recklessly heaped up. The history of the French Revolution has especially suffered from this tendency to moralise, and all the more because we have not yet sensibly outlived it. Public feeling in England is no longer, indeed, what it was in the old war-times, when to excuse France was to be the enemy of God and the king; when Pitt allowed the French assignats to be counterfeited; and when Canning persuaded the English public that the murder of a French ambassador by a barbarous prince was really little more than an exquisite joke. We admit pretty generally that Louis XVI. was as imbecile as he was well-meaning, and that some deeper causes than the mere thirst of blood or the lust of plunder determined the terrible war of class against class. Probably Mr. Carlyle represents with some obvious abatements the current opinion on these subjects, which, indeed, has taken form and colour in great measure from himself. With a fulness and precision of knowledge to which those who differ most from him will most willingly do homage, with unrivalled pictorial power for grouping and fixing phantasmagoria, and with genuine sympathies for violence which sometimes perhaps lead him to overrate a noisy hero, a Mirabeau, or a Danton, Mr. Carlyle has produced a work which Frenchmen denounce as heartless, and which Englishmen accept chiefly as the epic of a great moral judgment upon times and men with whom they have no sympathy. Sans-culottism triumphant over imbecility and vice is the artist's idea throughout. In the reign of Louis XVI. he sees only crumbling altars, a dishonoured throne, an Arcadia of paint and patches in the saloons, and grim misery in the cottage; in the Revolution a great volcanic outburst, a few leaders trying vainly to stop the lava-flood with speeches, the fiery molten mass sweeping over the land, and a perspective of

quiet homes and vineyards that are to grow hereafter out of the new and firmer soil. Imagine Mr. Carlyle an evangelical preacher, and he might have given all this from the pulpit when George III. was king, with even a fair chance of rising to be a royal chaplain. Seldom, perhaps, have genius and knowledge found so little to change in a popular theory.

It is not unnatural that the French view of the Revolution should be more appreciative than this, even in those who have no sympathy with its results. The apologists of 1789 are as much interested as the defenders of the old monarchy in showing that the order of things was in fault rather than the men. All good out of all evil, or all evil out of all good, are suppositions alike incredible. In fact, the greater difficulty to a student of De Tocqueville is to understand why the Revolution was necessary. Admit that Louis XVI. was a man of fifth-rate capacity, he was yet a better king in every sense of the word than his grandfather; and two of his ministers, Turgot and Necker, were able and popular. Admit that France did not hold the position a first-rate power might aspire to, and it is none the less certain that it had risen steadily, had freed America, had retrieved its credit against England, and had nothing to fear from any neighbouring state. The finances were embarrassed, but trade and commerce were on the whole prospering; there was no national bankruptcy as under the regency, and it was possible to contract loans, which neither the Revolutionary Government nor even the first Napoleon ever achieved. The court was more moral than it has been at any other time between Louis XIII. and Louis Philippe. The upper classes were certainly not devout, but they had outlived Voltaire, and the theism of Rousseau was in fashion. Above all, philanthropy was the rage. The Count de Ségur tells an amusing story of an officer who came to him to be whipped privately, that he might estimate the moral effects of flogging in the army. Ségur found at the end of the operation that he must either fight his friend, or submit to a few blows himself as a pledge of secrecy. A society was formed to purchase Mesmer's secret for the good of the poor. The districts of Brittany and La Vendée, in which absenteeism was least prevalent among the noble families, were precisely those which refused most steadily to accept the Revolution. But, in fact, the honourable roll of names—La Fayette, La Rochejacquelin, La Tour d'Auvergne—who figure on either side in the revolutionary annals; the courage with which hundreds of unnamed men and women and village priests met death sooner than renounce their principles; the virtues of Roland, Carnot, and a host of others among the middle classes—are the best evidence that society was not rotten at the core. It was not so

esteemed in England at the time. Our fathers judged France in a crude and imperfect way, no doubt, but still on the whole correctly; and they welcomed the first news of the taking of the Bastille with a thrill of honest exultation. It was only when the movement proved to be leaderless, when the nation passed from the hands of the purchased Mirabeau to those of Marat, Robespierre, and Barrère, when a panic-stricken mob believed the most violent man to be the best patriot, and blood flowed like water in the streets, that our upper and middle classes swung round violently to more than their king's conservatism. It was only after some years, when the contemporaries of Sandwich and Lyttelton, who had rivalled the court of Louis XV. in profligacy, who had grown up in the traditions of the English sceptical philosophy, and had talked openly of confiscating the church revenues,—had come to believe that the doctrines of Scott and Wilberforce were perhaps safer for their souls and their properties,—that a moral theory grew up which saw the Nemesis of crime in 1789. The belief was in itself a tribute to the connexion between the past order and actual events. It was felt that an accursed generation must have sprung from evil parentage.

The work of M. Lavergne on the Provincial Assemblies, which Necker and Calonne revived for a time, is a curious complement to M. de Tocqueville's far wider and more profound work on *The Old Régime and the Revolution*. The general tone of highly educated Frenchmen is at this moment anti-imperialist, and M. de Lavergne evidently tends to regard the Revolution as unnecessary. Had they been allowed to grow up to maturity and to work, he thinks the provincial assemblies might have made most of the necessary changes which the Revolution effected at the cost of much suffering and waste and on the ruins of liberty. We think he succeeds in showing to demonstration that there was a class of educated and intelligent men, capable of self-government, through the length and breadth of France, at the time when the crash of doom for the visible order came. This result, however different from the Carlylesque theory, will neither appear new nor paradoxical to Frenchmen; and M. de Lavergne's book is chiefly valuable, therefore, as a happy verification of the theory on a matter never fully explored hitherto, and for us in England because it is written from the constitutional point of view, which we naturally regard as the most important. There remains, of course, the question whether these institutions could have satisfied the wants of society at the end of the eighteenth century. We confess that on this side we think M. de Lavergne's arguments inadequate.

A point of some importance, and one which M. de Lavergne's

plan does not embrace, is the question in what way the provincial assemblies which once existed throughout France had disappeared. Down to Richelieu's ministry we find them existing in full activity. In 1637 they headed the opposition to an unpopular war,—an opposition which reached the length of revolt,—and the cardinal replaced them by intendants, answering pretty much to the modern prefects. That so great a change should have been effected almost noiselessly may seem surprising. Only once, in 1648, when all the old feudal elements of France were in revolt against the disjointed power of the crown, was an attempt made to restore the old system. The particular grievance most acutely felt seems to have been that the intendants were not punishable by any process of law, even for malversation of funds. Mazarin was forced to give way, and the power of the obnoxious officers was limited by various restrictions, till, in 1654, the final triumph of the court allowed it to recall all its concessions. From that time, whatever might be the opinion of mild theorists with aristocratic tendencies, such as Fénelon, the public at large does not seem to have cherished even a sentimental regret for its local assemblies. The reason of this apathy was not that the intendants were popular, or that men thought they were better governed than they could govern themselves, but that the provincial assemblies had been too unimportant to leave any durable trace on the people's memory. In a certain sense France, even in the sixteenth century, had almost as much representation as England. It had its parliaments for laws; its synods, more independent than our convocation, for church matters; and these assemblies to regulate taxation. But from the greater area of the country, which made intercommunication difficult, and from the diverse growth and historical traditions of the provinces, which had never been thoroughly fused, the collective powers of the state were frittered away among a host of little assemblies, which in ordinary times were scarcely more important than town-councils. A parliament with no military force at its disposal was really of less power for good or evil than the seigneurs who held courts of justice on their estates, decided what feudal dues the peasantry were to pay, and allowed or forbade them to be Calvinists. The Grands Jours d'Auvergne, which record the experience of a royal commission sent down to redress the most flagrant feudal abuses, give some idea of what actually went on in parts of France. The instance of a certain Marquis de Canillac, who lived by what we should now call brigandage, and whom the parliament of Toulouse hanged in effigy, and who watched the ceremonial so nearly affecting himself from a window in the market-place, will sufficiently show what

powers were wielded by the highest judicial court in the province. The provincial assemblies were even more limited in their functions. Their business was to assess among themselves the taxes which the central power imposed. They could not tax the lands which the nobles farmed personally, or prevent the privileged order from oppressing the serfs *de tennement* and *de corps* in the most approved feudal fashion. Nor could they sweep away the *corvée* or forced-labour system, the tolls on markets and on roads, the taxes on sales of land, and the countless other little vexatious imposts which the privileged class clung to as signs of superiority. The clergy, again, were an independent body, who commonly gave the crown a benevolence instead of any regular tax. Neither could the assemblies interfere with the right of their neighbours to tax commerce in its transit. Practically, therefore, their chief power was to protect themselves, after the fashion of those days, by retaliatory imposts; their chief privilege the right of apportioning burdens which they did not vote and could not apply, in the manner most tolerable to the province. No doubt even this was a substantial good. But it was not one for which the middle classes of Normandy or Poitou would be disposed to struggle against the royal authority. Of that political power which we have learned to connect with votes of money the provincial assemblies could have no idea. How was Bourges or Perigord,—how were a dozen isolated districts,—to refuse to support the royal policy, supposing even that they were called upon to vote supplies, and not, as was in fact the case, to assess them?

We have spoken now of the time when the assemblies were dissolved under Richelieu. No doubt their importance and real use would have increased largely if they had lasted longer. Already, under Louis XIV., judges had begun to discuss whether serfdom was not unchristian, and *ipso facto* null: under Louis XVI. it had mostly ceased to exist. The land slowly passed from the hands of the unthrifty seigneurs into the grasp of an eager peasant proprietary, who valued it doubly as the symbol of emancipation and the means of existence. From the time of Colbert downwards government took the middle classes into its service. The national wealth did not increase sensibly, but it changed hands; it passed from “seigneurs” and marquises to farmers of the revenue, to merchants and manufacturers. It was impossible that this growth of the middle and lower classes, coupled with the general establishment of law, should not tell upon the importance of such local assemblies as still existed here and there, in what were called the “*pays d’état*.” They became efficient bodies simply because industrial progress was in the interest of all. De Tocqueville has

sketched the history of the estates of Languedoc. They were not framed under the happiest auspices; for one of the three estates, the clergy, was composed of royal nominees, and the houses generally could only meet on a royal writ of convocation. They assembled for a few fixed days only; they were watched and directed by royal commissioners; and they could not bring an action or borrow a thousand livres without warrant from the crown. But because they were composed of men transacting their own business, they turned a desert into a paradise. They bought up the right to levy the royal taxes after their own fashion. They taxed themselves for roads and public works so vigorously that the government interfered, and warned them not to exhaust themselves in their zeal for the public good. The estates, in their answer, showed not only that they had derived a profit from their enterprises, but that they had extinguished pauperism. It is possible that Languedoc was not more prosperous than the district of Limoges, which had Turgot for its intendant, and which was then said to resemble a separate and happy state imprisoned in a miserable empire. But the fact that France had only one Turgot, and that the association of Languedoc renewed its members perpetually, and often retained its influence for good, is decisive in favour of the constitutional experiment. Nor is there any reason to believe that the other provinces of France might not, in their various degrees, have been equally well administered by similar corporations. Unfortunately, no one thought, no one was likely to think, under Louis le Grand and Louis le Bien-aimé, of such trifles as provincial institutions. Perhaps it was lucky for Languedoc that the hatred of liberty which induced Madame du Barry and her august lover to extinguish the parliament of Paris was limited by their love of ease and an imperfect knowledge of France. The province flourished in distant obscurity.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that the upholders of a strong central authority are necessarily and always hostile to certain modified forms of representative government. In the famous *Travels of Polichinello*, which Lammenais' irony scathed, it is laid down as a maxim of royal statecraft, "divide people from people, province from province, city from city; let the people amuse itself with the innocent diversion of municipal managements, ambitions, and contests; revive the local spirit by emancipating the communes; and the spirit of nationality will cease to be the devil that intoxicates all heads." Accordingly, when Maupeou dissolved the parliament of Paris, he created in its place a royal court and six superior councils in great towns, such as Lyons and Arras. He was pasquinaded for his pains:

"La cour royale est accouchée
De six petits parlementaux,
Tous composés de coquinaux :
Le diable emporte la couvée!"

Yet in 1771 the parliamentary theories of Montesquieu were even more popular than the democratic Utopia of Rousseau. But the minister's adroitness had deceived no one. It was felt that one strong body was worth any number of small ones, and that the question was not of local management, but of national liberties. So far as the new scheme had any result, it discredited representative institutions without strengthening the monarchy.

To Turgot belongs the honour of having tried to effect genuine reforms. In his Memoir on Municipalities he pointed out that the want of public spirit was directly owing to the want of a constitution. On the one hand industry was paralysed, because no great public work could be undertaken without orders from Paris; on the other hand, the great mass of the people, having no share in the government, and no apparent interest in the taxes raised from them, regarded the state as their natural enemy, and defrauded it in every possible way. Turgot's scheme for remedying this was at least comprehensive. Besides a proposition for political gymnasia, in which the duties of citizenship were to be taught, he sketched a whole hierarchy of representative councils for villages, towns, arrondissements, and provinces. As all these were to begin operations within a year, we may assume that the professorship of politics would practically have been found unnecessary. Bating that rather absurd detail, the rest of the scheme was at least promising. Its main principles were, that property was to be represented, not heads; that the rights of property were derived from its contributions to the public service; and that the ultimate ideal of taxation was to make it simple and direct. Accordingly all customs and excise duties and all burdens on labour, such as the *corvée*, were to be swept away. The duties of the assemblies were to assess existing imposts in the most easy and equitable fashion, to undertake and control public works, and to provide for the poor. A supreme council of delegates from the provincial assemblies was to meet every year, to receive from the king in person or from the minister of finance a statement of the sums required for the national service or for public works. The council would be authorised to express opinions and to raise any additional sums for local purposes; but it could not refuse to grant the sums demanded by the crown, and was not designed to have any opinion on foreign politics or the home administration. We may fairly believe that, beginning much as the English Com-

mons began, such an assembly would have gone on, like them, to discuss the measures for which money was to be raised. In one important respect, however, Turgot's assembly would have had the disadvantage of our English lower house even under Edward I. With us the tax-assessing body has always been united in theory to the king's supreme court of justice and council. Throughout France the parliaments were the constitutional courts of justice, and the event showed that they were extremely jealous of their new rival. On the other hand, there was no independent body that could be called even in theory the king's council. Practically therefore, though we regard Turgot's scheme as a conception of genius, and believe that it might ultimately have been made to work, we think it would have encountered great difficulties in starting, and must have undergone important changes to become really efficient. His supreme council must not for a moment be confounded with our English parliaments.

Unhappily Turgot fell from power before his plans could be carried out. The parliament of Paris, conservative to the core on all questions that affected privilege and property, united itself in an unholy alliance to the court nobility, and denounced the innovating administration with the hack arguments of a protective aristocracy. A base intrigue completed the ruin of the one great statesman of the times. The *corvée* was restored, and the peasants driven back to it with blows; the close laws of apprenticeship were revived; and the excise was maintained in its old barbarous rigour. The new minister, Necker, has eclipsed Turgot in reputation, from the accident that he was the last capable servant of the old monarchy, whose name for a moment became a party-cry, and that a clever daughter engraved his panegyric on a philosophical sketch of the Revolution. There was some excuse for this amiable enthusiasm. Necker was in no sense a great man; but he had talents as a political writer and banker, which would have given him a position at any time. It was said of George Grenville, that "could he have enforced payment of the Manilla ransom, he could have counted it." In the same way it may be admitted of Necker, that if he did not restore the French finances, he at least introduced an accurate system of book-keeping; and if he did not conjure the political storm, he foretold its fluctuations and end with rare sagacity. Never nation rushed headlong upon its fate with more precise warning of what was to come from the dogmatic Cassandra of its exchequer. But in action Necker was feeble when the times wanted strength, and conservative when there was no hope but from radical remedies. As a moneyed man, and a member of the Genevese oligarchy, his sympathies

were all with the established order and property, and he only interfered to change when it was a manifest question of redressing waste and anarchy. He would have liked to hit upon a compromise between free trade and protection, between liberty and serfdom. In fact he oscillated between one and the other. Now an edict appeared forbidding the exportation of machinery; now restrictions on manufactures were taken off. The decree abolishing serfdom on the crown-lands was so worded as to confirm it on the lands of the church and the nobility. The *corvée*, which Turgot had abolished, was provisionally restored. As a sensible man, Necker saw the disadvantages of the actual system by which "a single man," as he himself put it, "sometimes present, sometimes absent, sometimes well-informed, sometimes incapable, is to govern the most important departments of the public order." In fact France was administered in the offices of the capital. Nevertheless Necker did not desire to suppress the intendants, only to diminish the evils of centralisation, and to make them viceroys where they had been satraps. He carried out this analogy so completely as to give them a permanent council, with the power of advising and superintending the execution of measures decided by the provincial assemblies which he intended to create. The assemblies themselves were to supply the same wants that had been contemplated in Turgot's scheme, but their constitution was different and more aristocratic. The members, instead of a property qualification, were to be taken from the three estates, the nobles and clergy together making up half, and the president being *ex officio* a clergyman or a crown nominee. The members themselves were to be partly nominated by the crown in the first instance, but were afterwards to fill up vacancies, at least partially, themselves. They had unbounded liberty of deliberating in the presence of royal commissioners, and they might correspond with government, and even raise taxes, but they could not spend money without the minister's express permission. Thus guarded, the institutions would not only not be dangerous, but, in Necker's opinion, would serve as lightning-conductors at times like those when there was thunder in the air. He had observed with regret "an unquiet and crude spirit of criticism, which" gave "a constant aliment to the desire which the parliaments have to meddle with the administration." All this would now be diverted to questions of drainage and turnpike roads. Nevertheless, as the experiment of liberty under a despotism is always hazardous, Necker carried out his plans very cautiously. He created one assembly at a time, and had just achieved a fourth, when he fell from power. M. de Lavergne ascribes his fall, in part, to the surreptitious publication of his views about making the assemblies a coun-

terpoise to parliaments. There is no doubt that it added, perhaps not quite undeservedly, to the number of his opponents; but the fact seems to be that Necker, a man of irritable vanity, serving under a weak king, allowed himself to be worried out of the service by an unscrupulous rival, who annoyed him with secret libels and petty checks.

We have dwelt upon the circumstances under which Necker's plan was first brought out, because they go far to explain its limited success. No doubt France at large desired representative institutions, but not so organised as to be little more than debating societies, and not so manipulated as to trammel the action of the parliaments. Suspicion was aroused, and it was even said that the new assemblies were only designed to enable the crown to borrow money in the provinces. The crown had fallen into the same sort of mistake that James II. committed when he thought the English Dissenters would accept liberty of conscience at the price of breaking the law and bringing in Popery. Yet liberty of conscience was none the less a good thing because it was favoured at court for bad reasons; and the French assemblies in their working bore splendid evidence to the value of the representative principle, however limited. Of the four Necker established, two, those of Bourges and of Montauban, continued to meet and work till the Revolution (1779-1789). Of the public spirit that prevailed in the assembly of Bourges there remains excellent evidence. Ideas of duty and equality had filtered in from the capital, and the local gentry, for a wonder, were less aristocratic than the court. They rejected the idea of filling up their ranks by their own votes, on the ground that the privilege of election belonged of right to all who were interested. A proposal to confine the votes of the nobles to the twelve principal estates, thus constituting, as it were, a territorial peerage, was voted down in the same way as unfair; and it was agreed that all land-owners of a certain position were to be eligible in rotation. The votes of the *tiers état* were to be taken with those of the two privileged orders. In its practical measures the assembly was perhaps less happy. The chief taxes in Berri were a poll-tax, a tallage or property tax assessed arbitrarily on all who were not noble, the *corvée* or forced labour, and the *gabelle* or salt-excise. A worse system could scarcely be imagined; and yet it was difficult to make any change where the people at large were distrustful of the government. The assembly at first inclined to the substitution of a tithe upon produce; a tax which seems to combine every possible inconvenience,—a costly excise staff, constant annoyance to the cultivator, and a tax upon improvements. One of the members suggested a radical change, by the introduction of new

taxes on land, personalty, and trade profits; but the measure was too sweeping to be entertained by a body with limited powers. Practically, therefore, the assembly at first did nothing beyond petitioning the king to let the tax-assessors be in future chosen by the district, and to substitute a fixed charge for one of the smaller taxes, the twentieths. Later on, it succeeded in abolishing the *corvée*. At the same time it increased the sum spent upon roads in the district, and triumphed by the king's authority over the sulky resistance of the royal intendant and engineers. It adopted a vast plan, by the Duc de Charost, for connecting Berri by a network of canals with the Loire, and voted a large yearly sum towards its accomplishment. It took steps to enclose the commons, founded an agricultural school, and imported rams to improve the breed of the province. All these measures may seem little more than what private societies often achieve in England; but they came at a time when reforms were doubly valuable, and they at least serve to show that the upper and middle classes of Berri were able to work together harmoniously for the common good.

The success of the Assembly of Bourges was equalled or even eclipsed by its sister institution at Montauban. Of course, to a great extent, the two bodies were occupied with similar local details of little importance. But there were some differences which brought out several points of interest in the more southern province. The taxes in Guienne were chiefly raised by an assessment on the supposed real value of land. The assembly caused a new valuation to be made by an engineer of high eminence, and discussed and rejected the pendulum as the basis of a new general measure. Here, equally as in Berri, the commons were found to be a practical nuisance, and the assembly proposed to divide them, partly by heads and partly in proportion to the taxes paid by the villagers. The example of a country gentleman who had commuted his rents of produce for fixed payments in grain, giving practically a tenant-right or even a copyhold tenure to those who held of him, appeared so worthy of imitation that the assembly resolved to exempt such agreements from the usual stamp-duty. In spite of the intendant's remonstrances, reports on the acreage tilled and the prospects of the crops were published every year for the enlightenment of the public; the minister not sharing his subordinate's anxiety. A census of the nobles was taken to ascertain who were really entitled to exemption from the tallage or land-tax; and about 800 families are supposed to have been struck off the list, while more than 1800 proved their right to be exempt. The fact is worth noticing by the way, as a proof to what extent privilege in France was still carried; and it a little diminishes the value

of a previous statement by M. de Lavergne, that "their real immunities amounted, in fact, to something very small." Two thousand seven hundred families not paying land-tax in a single province must have been a perpetual grievance to their fellow-citizens. It remains only to notice that, among the most active members of the assembly, and the intendant's most vigorous opponent, was a churchman, the Bishop of Rôdez. Roads, studs, the gauge of wines, the manufacture of leather, nothing was too small or too great for his energy. By profession the successor of St. Peter, he was, in fact and at heart, the scholar of Turgot.

We have dwelt upon the history of these two assemblies because, by a singular fortune, they lasted long enough to test the plan. That the use of such bodies to suggest good measures, and even to take the initiative under sanction of the court, might have been very great, cannot, we think, be doubted. On the other hand, the fact which M. de Lavergne does not notice, that the two in existence were quite powerless to remonstrate against bad government in a minister, and dared not murmur, for instance, when M. de Fleury, Necker's successor, imposed a third twentieth by his own authority, will help to explain why provincial assemblies generally met with so little warm support even from moderate reformers. At first it seemed as if their days were numbered. The first act of M. de Fleury when he took office was to cancel the letters-patent which had been issued for the establishment of a new assembly; and the step won him the hearty gratitude and support of the parliament of Paris. Before long, however, a state of things had arisen in which the government had to decide between some sweeping measures to restore its credit or bankruptcy. Necker himself had left a floating debt the amount of which was never justly ascertained, and for which his balance-sheet made no provision. The American war had liberated a whole continent, and retrieved the glory of France; but the spiritual gain in freedom and honour was partly compensated by an increased deficit in the exchequer. In this situation the finances had been entrusted to Calonne, a charlatan of talent, who announced that the secret of good management was "a liberal economy,"—in other words, to spend profusely, inspire confidence, and borrow with open hands. The courtiers accepted this theory as a revelation; and between purchases of estates at half their value, the discharge of debts to the crown, and actual pensions, the royal treasury made the fortune of some hundred happy nobles. Of course, this millennium could not last long; and after a brief summer-day of prosperity, during which he had duped the very province of Brittany, where he was best known and most hated, Calonne saw himself obliged to confront public inquiry. He determined on con-

voking the Notables, an archæological form of national council in which, out of a hundred and forty-four members, only six or seven were not technically noble. To these gentlemen he submitted the plan of such chief reforms as he thought would appease the nation. Among the first figured one for the establishment of provincial assemblies in the remaining *pays d'élection*, and his unavowed intention was to extend them to the *pays d'état*, as a substitute for the freer and therefore more dangerous bodies already in existence. The Notables were not disinclined to the institution in itself. They only demanded that the orders should be kept distinct, and that the president should always be a churchman or a noble. Opinion outside was less placable. Men persisted in believing that the ministry only conceded an instalment of parliamentary forms in order to cheat France out of the reality. "It is an outrage upon the nation," wrote Carra, "to propose to it, in the absence of the states-general, which are part of its constitution, to consent to fuse this institution into provincial assemblies, whose true condition will be that of banks to advance loans at the pleasure of the controller-general." But although Calonne fell from power, the assemblies survived him in the form authorised by the Notables. There were one or two slight differences besides the presidency between the present scheme and that inaugurated by Necker. The king was now to name one-half instead of a third of the members, and the remainder were to be chosen by electoral committees in the different parishes. The first of these regulations extended the royal power; the second practically undermined that of the seigneurs, who were now reduced to the level of their neighbours in their several districts. The change in ordinary times would have been simple and good; at a period of crisis and transition, it no doubt added to the antagonism of classes. For this, however, its originators are not to be blamed.

It is unnecessary to follow M. de Lavergne through his minute account of the different provincial assemblies that had time to meet and transact business before the Revolution had swept the old order irrevocably away. A fair instance of one, that perhaps gave the happiest promise of success, will suffice to show what the real working power of the institution was. The assembly of Upper Normandy, or Rouen, met in a province where the practical somewhat phlegmatic English type recalls to this day the old relations of the two countries, and where the chief interests of the inhabitants were connected with foreign commerce, with fisheries, and with manufactures. There was, therefore, every reason *à priori* why the representative system should succeed there, and the old traditions of the people went back to provincial estates which had survived Richelieu,

and only perished finally under Louis XIV. The parliament of Rouen proved itself honourably superior to vulgar jealousies, and welcomed the establishment of its sister but rival body. But if all this augured well for the assembly, it had, on the other hand, to contend with more than ordinary difficulties. It met just as the famous commercial treaty of 1786 had begun to come into operation between France and England. To Englishmen of 1864 that treaty appears a monument of statesman-like sagacity. It relaxed several points of international law in the interests of commerce; admitting, for instance, that the neutral flag should cover all merchandise that was not contraband of war, and, curiously enough, including among those the materials for the construction and equipment of ships. By concessions of this sort, and by reducing the customs-duties on wines, spirits, oils, and articles of taste, Pitt obtained admission for all the chief English manufactures of cotton, iron, and pottery, at almost nominal duties for those times, of from 10 to 15 per cent. The result of course was, that the French market was at first glutted with English manufactures, and that many of the smaller Norman houses were ruined in the disastrous competition, or expected ruin. No doubt all this would have righted itself in a very short time, as Manchester and Staffordshire improvements were forced upon the reluctant capitalists of Rouen and Elbeuf. France possessed at that very critical epoch a mechanician of genius, M. Périer; and only fourteen years later, at the time of the peace of Amiens, the English and Scotch manufacturers assured Pitt in a memorial that they were in imminent danger from French competition. Nevertheless, for the moment the imports from England appeared heavily in excess of the exports to it, and French financiers of the old school began to calculate the moment when all their gold should be drained away to the benefit of their rival. These prejudices have lasted so long, that MM. Bailli, Flassan, Forcade, Sismondi, and Martin, may be cited among those who have denounced the treaty as ruinous; and we know only of M. Droz and M. Cochut—names of some authority, it is true—who have ventured to defend it as sound in principle. Nevertheless, as Vergennes had concluded it in order to purchase a durable peace at any price,* and as the exporting provinces of the South

* We must protest, in passing, against M. de Lavergne's statement, that "the government of Louis XVI. had shown itself more enlightened than the nation; struck with the marked inferiority of French manufactures, it had wished to give them the stimulus of foreign competition," &c. This is merely the dialectic of De Maistre, to contrive a philosophical justification, and then assert it as a historical truth. The fact is, that during three years Vergennes had hindered any treaty from being made, although one had been stipulated in the Treaty of Paris. He gave way at last on political, not on economical, grounds, believing

favoured it, it was pretty much matter of certainty that it would not be abrogated. The assembly of Rouen, therefore, had to mediate, in a commercial crisis, between the manufacturer wanting protection and the government refusing to protect.

Bearing these difficulties in mind, we shall find every thing to admire in the conduct of the assembly. We are inclined, indeed, to suspect that it represented rather the richer than the smaller capitalists of the province,—the men who could face competition, rather than the men who had no reserve funds for improvements. We know that the full effects of the change were as yet matter of prevision more than of certainty. Still the preamble of the committee's report, inclining strongly to take the most gloomy view, and only qualifying the apprehension of ruin by the admission that it was not yet matter of demonstration, does not prepare us for the great practical good sense of their results. They trace the cheapness of English goods to the better machines employed, the command of coal, and the finer wool obtained from English sheep. They believe that all these advantages might be fully obtained in France, if a little care and energy were brought to bear. The Committee of Commerce followed up this general summary by a proposal to establish a permanent bureau to promote commerce and manufactures; and application was made to the crown for a grant of 300,000 livres for that year only, to meet the more urgent demands of the actual crisis. We agree with M. de Lavergne that this movement was admirable. That it was a little above the level at which public feeling could be maintained appeared afterwards in 1791, when the "Deputation of Manufactures" obtained by constant pressure, from a National Assembly nowise inclined to support producers against consumers, that the tariff on tissues generally should be raised to about 25 per cent. The "generality" of Rouen, however, gave another proof of sound trade principles, in proposing to try the effect of leaving bakers to fix the price of bread at Havre, and gradually to extend the same permission, if it appeared to answer well, to the rest of the province. Unfortunately here the weak point of the institution appeared. The assembly could decree nothing of its own authority, and was obliged to refer the measure to the local parliament. The absurd complication of Necker's system could scarcely have a better illustration.

But all provinces were not as well disposed as that of Nor-

that whatever the loss might be, it would be less than the waste of an English war, and that quiet was indispensable for the monarchy. Pitt, and indirectly Shelburne, under the influence of Adam Smith's ideas, were the real originators of the measure; and it was regarded every where as a triumph of English diplomacy.

mandy to accept the new assemblies. Accident and local causes seem to have determined the first centres of resistance. The population of Bordeaux had old recollections of independence from the English times downwards to those of the Huguenots, whose last stronghold had been Rochelle; and the town of Bordeaux itself had been Frondist under Mazarin, as it was to be royalist under Napoleon. Louis XV. had sent the parliament into an exile which only ended with his death. Its members were all the more resolute to maintain the rights for which they had already suffered. When the edict establishing the assemblies was sent down to them, they refused to register or confirm it, on the ground that it required them to sanction an institution which was unknown to the existing laws, which was quite undefined, and which it was left to the king's pleasure to limit or extend as he should please. The objection does not seem unreasonable; and even if it might sound a little captious to those who were certain of the king's good intentions and absolute wisdom, there need not, one would think, have been any great difficulty in satisfying it. But the ministry contemptuously returned no answer to the parliament's remonstrances, and ordered the first steps for the meeting of the assemblies to be taken as if nothing had happened. To this insolent defiance of law the parliament replied by forbidding the assembly of the Limousin to meet, and at last by severely censuring the minister. The "much-enduring" king banished the parliament to Limourne; and when it refused to register this new decree, the commandant of the province took a troop of soldiers to the parliament-house. In Franche Comté, comparatively a new province, the opposition was based on the same grounds, but extended to the composition of the assemblies. "An assembly so organised," said the parliament of Besançon, "though its beginnings be ostentatiously adorned with a few illustrious names and dear to the province, could not be regarded as a provincial assembly, since the province would have no part in its formation; and as it would depend on the commissioner assigned it and on the decrees of council, it could only be considered as an additional staff of administrators, of the same species as those with whom they would be associated." Practically the parliament triumphed, and the provincial assembly never met. In Dauphiné the province had never forgotten, and constantly demanded, its old House of Estates. When the assembly met, the parliament sent in a notice that it must transact no business till the decree for its organisation had been duly registered. Calonne's government answered this constitutional check by an ukase superseding it, and two *lettres de cachet* for two of the leading magistrates. The parliament sent up a vigorous remonstrance against

the *lettres de cachet*, and the keeper of the seals answered with a curiously Irish argument, that his majesty could not understand how good subjects could consider it a punishment to be summoned into the royal presence, and that the king would not allow his courts to attack the exercise of a power which family interests and the peace of the state often needed, and which the king was glad to think he had employed more moderately than any of his predecessors. Briefly, the *lettres de cachet* were a privilege, not a punishment, and must be sustained at all cost, because they were often necessary against offenders; and being often necessary, the king was glad to think he had seldom used them. There is no country in which it is so fatal to be ridiculous as in France. Public opinion and the parliaments declared every where against the detestable principle of arbitrary arrests. The ministry continued to think feebly and act violently. A further step downwards was taken only a few days later, when a captain of the guards entered the parliament-house of Paris and arrested two of the members. It was a curious parody on the history of Charles I. But the Bourbons are one of those races for whom history has no lessons.

The crisis soon came. The parliament of Paris was summoned (May 8, 1788) to Versailles, to witness the registration of five edicts, which the king had resolved to impose by his own authority. The first four were good or well-meant,—on the reform of justice, the suppression of useless offices, and the abolition of torture. The last took away from the parliaments their most important function of registering edicts, by which alone the royal power had been in any sense limited, and transferred it to a plenary court of some forty royal nominees. Even these were not to have a right of veto; they might only remonstrate, and send up deputies to give their opinions. It was a *coup d'état* of the worst kind, at a time when the royal power needed confidence more than any thing. Till quite lately the parliaments had not been popular. The nobles by birth disliked the *noblesse de la robe*. The clergy had an old grudge against bodies which were commonly Jansenist, and always secular in feeling. The people knew that the parliament of Paris had headed the opposition to Necker, in order that it might maintain an unequal taxation founded on unpopular privileges. The professional constitution of the parliaments had left the name without any national prestige. But all classes felt instinctively that the present contest was for freedom against a Turkish despotism, for the realities against the forms of a constitution. No one doubted that the king was an amiable, well-meaning man, who would like to make France happy in his own way; but they saw clearly that he meant to take his conceptions of

happiness from Brienne and Lamoignon, and to give the minimum of self-government with the maximum of paternal authority. They felt that he believed in the imprescriptible right of kings to cancel charters and privileges which royalty itself had granted and confirmed. Of the catechism of the rights of man there could of course be no question with such a neophyte.

Would Englishmen have felt or acted differently? We are not easily lashed into that southern exaltation of feeling which led the unarmed citizens of Grenoble to throw themselves upon the regiments of the line and drive them out of the streets. Our revolutions are commonly made by the middle-classes, and do not extend to such men as the mountaineers of Béarn, who forced the parliament of Paris to meet again and swear fidelity to the crown on the cradle of Henry IV. We have more affinity perhaps with the slow tenacity of the Bretons, who sent up a second deputation to Paris when a first was thrown into the Bastille, and prepared to go on until the whole province should be in prison or in arms. But we think the precedents of English history show that we should not have allowed the best of kings to set aside old constitutional rights at his pleasure, or to replace parliaments, however corrupt, by debating-clubs on drainage and local assessments, however excellent. There is, indeed, one instance in our annals of a king who tried to supersede the two houses by a simpler and more tractable "plenary court." His name was Richard II., and he did not survive the experiment a year.

Hitherto, throughout our narrative, we have treated the question of the provincial assemblies as one only between the crown and the nation, and have tried to show that, however much their plan may have been an advance on the system of Louis XV., assuming that no other reform was possible,—however wise and well-intentioned their first members may have been,—there were yet grave reasons why France should not accept them in exchange for the old institutions they supplanted, or for such a possible constitution as moderate reformers desired. We have purposely looked exclusively on the bright side of the picture. There is, however, another side which M. de Lavergne absolutely ignores, and which M. de Tocqueville brings out in strong relief. Assemblies of generous, ardent men, scattered here and there over a volcanic country like France, at a time when hidden fires were already hissing under the soil, were pretty certain to make outlets for the lava with their divining-rods. In the hot impulse to do good, several of them addressed a series of "murderous questions"—as De Tocqueville not inaptly calls them—to the small farmers and peasants of their respective

districts, asking them to point out the most obnoxious classes, to reckon up the persons unjustly privileged and assess the loss they occasion; in a word, to calculate what they have to gain by a *Jacquerie*. The answers to such inquiries may be easily guessed. All the local gossip about the squire's wealth, and privileges, and habits of life, is given with curious minuteness, and the village scribes observe that no one profits by his revenues. The Church does not find more favour; the curé's salary is constantly declared to be excessive; and the fees for all church functions, even for burials, draw down bitter comment. But, above all, the tax-gatherer is denounced: "odious, ferocious, crushing," are among the terms employed to stigmatise his activity; he himself is "a tyrant," and "a despot," "to whom nothing is sacred." It is evident that Necker's plan to divide the assemblies, that they might be less powerful, was not calculated for critical times. It was like scattering a fire instead of keeping it in a grate.

We have noticed already M. de Lavergne's assertion, that the real immunity from taxation of the privileged orders was something very insignificant, in connection with the case of one not very large province, where from 2000 to 3000 persons claimed exemption from land-tax on the property in their own hands. But the "*taille*" was only one burden on industry; and although it cannot have been pleasant for a small farmer to know that his neighbour's title was a receipt for land-tax, this alone need not, perhaps, have occasioned many heart-burnings. A more offensive privilege was that of not being drawn for the conscription, which the nobles claimed and obtained even for their valets. Add to this the seignorial dues upon fairs and markets, the royalty on sales of land within the noble's domain, the exclusive right to keep a dovecot or a mill, and the singular oppression of the game-laws, in a country where the land was already infinitely subdivided, and where a gentleman hunted in right of his birth, not of his property, and the full extent of the tribute from the working-classes to those who had "taken the trouble to be born" will begin to be understood. It must be remembered, too, that the privileged classes clutched at the semblance of power, and at all that indicated distinction, in proportion as they were losing their hold on realities. Under Louis XIV. the common soldier was half ennobled by his profession, and might become an officer, as Cavalier did: the soldier of fortune, like Catinat, from an obscure legal family, might win his marshal's baton. Under Louis XVI., Champfort tells us there were two examiners for commissions; the first to report on the cadet's proficiency, and the second on his pedigree; and, he adds, that for some time the second plucked all whom the first passed. Even after the Revolution the council of the

émigrés, who were preparing to reconquer France, would only grant a commission to an untitled royalist who proposed to raise a regiment, with the qualifying clause that he was no gentleman. In society matters were even worse. For a long time it was a principle that no "gentilhomme" was to fight out of his caste, however gross the provocation given might have been, and a citizen who refused to submit quietly ran a good chance of being sent to the Bastille, as Voltaire actually was for being beaten. If cases of this sort were less common under Louis XVI., it was only because the king was more indulgent, and disliked to inflict suffering. The French patricians even wished to establish that their caste overruled the sacraments of the Church. Barrère, afterwards infamous as a triumvir, was engaged, for one of his first cases at the bar, against a man of good family who had carried off a tradesman's daughter, married her, lived with her for years, and then sought to repudiate her on the ground of inequality of rank. The whole nobility of the province assembled to support him, and only gave him up when they learned circumstances that put the offender outside the pale of ordinary forgiveness. Unfortunately the decree of the court did not touch the social issue that had been raised, or it might have been interesting to read a judicial declaration that blue and red blood could not mix, some ten years before the guillotine levelled all distinctions. We could multiply parallel cases, were it necessary. We only care to observe here that, where the untitled gentleman was insulted, the peasant lay at the mercy of his superior, and regarded any well-dressed man as inviolable. An Englishman visiting Paris not long before 1789, fell in casually with a drunken or brutal carter, who contrived to splash him from head to foot in a manner which left no doubt it was done intentionally. A little wizened gentleman in ruffles and a court-dress, furious at this insult to a foreigner, ran up and thrashed the offender heartily with his cane, while the man fell on his knees without an attempt at defence. The Englishman went home a republican. He had not mastered the theory so ably put forward by a "noble lieutenant-at Saumur," and reported by Courier: "That I being your lieutenant give you the bastinado, that you as sergeant give it to the soldiers, neither of us, I assure you, would be dishonoured by it." "Excellent; but, lieutenant, who is to give it to you?" "To me! No one, I should hope. I am a gentleman." "I am a man."

In that antithesis, the result of a rotten framework of society, the one great cause of the Revolution is contained. That the French mind is in itself more fitted to appreciate equality than liberty is perhaps true. As a highly sensitive race, the French are apt to base self-respect a little too much on external marks of

consideration; as a logical people, they undervalue tradition; and, as an impatient people, they dislike the slow results of self-government. Accordingly it would be easy to prove, by a catena of instances from the Middle Ages downwards, that there has always been a democratic under-current in their literature. That such a man as Pascal, under Mazarin and Louis XIV., should have declared property to be usurpation, the equality of goods the most just principle, and the majority the best arbiter, is a fact no theorist against the characteristics of race can pretend to set aside. Rousseau only said aloud what many thousands had thought. On the other hand, there were many causes why representative institutions might have had a fair chance in France of the eighteenth century. The example of England, in itself a most important one to men who had read Montesquieu, and for whom Chatham was no shadowy tradition, was clenched by the example of America, which seemed to show that freedom and equality were compatible. There were local recollections every where of states or assemblies that had been suppressed, and even the parliaments, since Louis the Well-beloved persecuted them, had become popular. Nor was there any definite theory to oppose to the parliamentary. Rousseau, indeed, had denounced it; but his thesis, that every man was entitled to an equal voice in the commonwealth, could only be realised in small communities like the Greek cities of antiquity, and was thus incompatible with the idea of national existence. There was, therefore, every chance for the king and his ministers, if they wished, to give the country a constitution like the English, and public opinion would have supported them in retaining greater power than the crown wielded among ourselves. The wishes of most men were—to be governed, but to chose their governors; to be taxed, but to control the expenditure and the means of raising the revenue; and lastly, to free land from all feudal burdens, and to open the public service to all classes, without distinction of rank. Reforms of this sort, however, to be effectual must be national, not local. The crown consented to create local assemblies, but gave them a semi-feudal constitution; allowed them only the right to discuss and advise; intended them as a substitute for the more powerful provincial estates, and as a counterpoise to the more independent parliaments. Finally, by an act that cannot be called isolated, it deprived the parliaments of their most important privilege, and entrusted it to a committee of courtiers. Is it wonderful, after this, if the representative principle was discredited; and is it the nation that should be blamed as impatient, or the crown as unwise?

We are far from saying that M. de Lavergne's work has not merit of a certain kind. Any history of rather obscure events

connected with great times has peculiar value. Any thing which convinces Englishmen that the Revolution was a Nemesis of rotten institutions, not of an immoral society, may teach us personal wisdom as well as historical charity. But M. de Lavergne is a special pleader throughout. He glides gently over the blunders of the court; omits or excuses the blunders of the assemblies, and leads us to infer, though he does not expressly say it, that a good and wise government was going on in the best possible way, when a single blunder—the attack on the power of the parliaments—ruined the best-accredited hopes for ever. If this were indeed true, the history of mankind would be little more than a sorrowful chance-medley, in which foresight and experience, and the best intentions, were less powerful for good than a single rash impulse or hasty act for evil. M. de Lavergne confounds the small occasion with the great causes of change. In ordinary times, and under a government that was commonly trusted, Brienne's *coup-d'état* could never have been attempted, or would only have produced his own ruin. But it was felt to be the one crowning act of a long series of usurpations, and it ruined the monarchy. Louis XVI. was a better-intentioned king than his grandfather; but his best ministers were not better than Choiseul, and his worst was as bad as Maupeou. He reaped the natural fruit of well-meaning, in a certain revival of confidence and affection, which prolonged the last days of the monarchy, which invested his death with the aureola of martyrdom, and gave his name a romantic interest which still makes it a power among men. The nobility of France numbered in its ranks many honourable and enlightened men like Lafayette, many chivalrous gentlemen like Laroche-Jaquelin, and many sensible country squires like those who sat in the provincial assemblies. The order generally was disposed to do all the good it could without any great sacrifice of its privileges. It did enough to suggest possible reforms, and was not allowed—perhaps would not have been willing—to complete more before the Revolution began. Its moral growth carried it with dignity through the Reign of Terror and the long years of exile; its political shortsightedness kept it what it still is, a caste isolated in a nation. That the Revolution was not all wisdom, any more than all mercy, is beyond doubt. It originated no important reforms, produced no single great man, and clung with all the tenacity of superstition to an impossible conception of human equality. But precisely because it had its roots in the past, and because its leaders had no original power except that of a frothy rhetoric, is it inexplicable on any theory that makes it an abnormal convulsion, or in any peculiar sense a divine fatality? It was a great upheaving of an impatient people to do imperfectly and quickly what their rulers were

carrying out by half measures, reluctantly and badly, or were trying to leave undone. We think it was unavoidable; and, with all its shortcomings, we believe it has accomplished more for France than any Necker-Brienne system could have done. Whether really great statesmanship might not have mitigated the evil and worked a higher good, is a question on which the highest human wisdom can only speculate.

ART. IV.—IRELAND.

L'Irlande, Sociale, Politique et Religieuse. Septième édition. Par Gustave de Beaumont. Paris, 1863.

Report on the supposed Progressive Decline of Irish Prosperity. By W. Neilson Hancock, LL.D. Dublin, 1863.

TWENTY years ago Ireland was the disgust of travellers, the grief and pain of philanthropists and moralists, the despair and opprobrium of statesmen. The condition of her population furnished apparently the one insoluble problem of the civilised world, as well as the standing and indelible reproach to England. She was beyond question the most miserable country in Europe, yet was under what we conscientiously believed to be the best government in Europe. Her people increased faster than any other, yet were more wretched than any other. Centuries of mistake, mismanagement, and injustice, acting on a very peculiar race and under very unfavourable circumstances, had resulted in a state of mingled suffering, degradation, and disaffection, which every Englishman felt to be disgraceful, but which no Englishman could see how to remedy. We had begun to be wise and equitable, but it was apparently too late. We had become tolerant; we had become just; we had become anxiously vigilant, and in some cases zealously charitable. But it was all in vain. It seemed as if social disorganisation had reached a point at which human energy and human sagacity were powerless. The peasants scraped together from their scanty potato-crofts, aided by extra wages at the English harvest-time, a miserable and inadequate subsistence. They could not sink lower; they could not feed worse; they could not become more utterly destitute; they had therefore no motive for not marrying—accordingly they married and multiplied *ad libitum*. The artisans in towns were incurably and absurdly unruly, and contrived by their turbulence to drive away almost every handicraft and manufacturing trade. The landlords, who for a long period had encouraged, or at least facilitated, an increase of numbers, which increased their rents without perceptibly increasing either their burdens or their obligations, had taken the alarm, but did not

know what to do, and had not yet learned to be either generous or protective. The spiritual leaders of this unhappy race taught them little but superstition, and their political leaders taught them little but lawlessness and disloyalty. A government—especially a constitutional government—is helpless when it has to deal with a body-politic at once thoroughly degraded, thoroughly disorganised, and thoroughly disaffected; with a people whose entire social state requires readjustment, and yet who are too numerous to be reformed with ease, too ignorant to reform themselves, and too free to be reformed by authority. Such political wisdom as we could then muster thought much, worked hard, tried to do its best; but the task had outgrown the power of man; and every man who applied himself to the problem was speedily made to feel that only Providence could solve it.

And Providence did solve it—solved it in a way in which man dared not have solved it, could not have had the heart to solve it, would have had no right to solve it. The plain truth, from which all who thoroughly investigated the matter shrank back aghast as soon as they realised it, was that there were upwards of *eight* millions of souls on land which did not yield adequate sustenance for more than five; that only a very lavish application of capital could materially increase that yield; and that capital was as scarce as labour was redundant. Nothing could be done—no field for the operation of improvement could be cleared—no career of amendment and prosperity could even be entered upon—till those enormously redundant numbers were reduced. The potato-rot appeared: the sustenance of a nation was literally swept away; famine came; pestilence followed; the terrified and disheartened people fled wherever they could; the wise and kind assisted their flight, and emigration wound up the process. Under the combined operation of these causes, the population of Ireland, which was 8,175,124 in 1841, had sank to 5,798,967 in 1861. But this decrease, startling and, we believe, unparalleled as it is, by no means measures the entire amount of the depopulation which has taken place. The potato-disease did not make its appearance till 1846. Up to that period we may suppose that the population had continued to increase at its former moderate rate, viz. about one half per cent per annum.* In that case, the real figures will stand thus:

Population in 1846	8,379,000
„ „ 1861	5,799,000
	<hr/>
	2,580,000

* Dr. N. Hancock, however, does not admit this assumption, and gives some reasons against it (p. 6). He is of opinion that the rate of increase had regularly decreased since 1831, and that in 1841 the population had nearly, or quite, reached the maximum it ever attained.

Showing a decrease of two millions and a half, or *thirty per cent*, in fifteen years.

Vast and rapid as this diminution of numbers has been, it has not been excessive. We have no hesitation in expressing our opinion that the process has not yet proceeded far enough. Few persons know, and no one who has not travelled in that country can fully realise how large a portion of the surface of Ireland is not only uncultivable, but unfit for cultivation; much of it being absolutely irreclaimable, and more of it incapable of repaying the cost of reclamation. More than *one-fifth*, or 4,500,000 acres out of a total area of 20,300,000, according to the last accounts, are either bog, waste, or otherwise useless; and only 15,500,000 are really cultivated, or likely to be so, or perhaps ought to be so. The number of acres described by official surveyors as absolutely and hopelessly *unimprovable* is 2,535,000. Let us study carefully the following tables, constructed from the official returns of agricultural statistics and the census returns.

TABLE I.

Provinces.	Total acres exclusive of water.	Acres under cultivation, 1862.	Acres absolutely unimprovable.	Possible acres available for culture.
Leinster . .	4,838,000	4,200,000	200,000	4,638,000
Munster . .	5,935,000	4,582,000	712,000	5,223,000
Ulster . . .	5,314,000	4,083,000	750,000	4,564,000
Connaught . .	4,233,000	2,734,000	873,000	3,360,000
	20,320,000	15,599,000	2,535,000	17,785,000

TABLE II.

Provinces.	Cultivated acres per head.			Possibly available acres per head.		
	1841.	1851.	1861.	1841.	1851.	1861.
Leinster	2.13	2.51	2.88	2.35	2.77	3.19
Munster	1.93	2.47	3.03	2.18	2.81	3.45
Ulster	1.71	2.02	2.13	1.91	2.22	2.38
Connaught . . .	1.92	2.70	3.00	2.36	3.33	3.70
	1.9	2.38	2.70	2.18	2.70	3.75

TABLE III.

Countries.	Total statute acres.	Population in 1861.	Acres per head.
England	32,000,000	18,954,000	1·7
Ireland	20,300,000	5,799,000	3·5

In order to draw the fitting inferences from Tables I. and II. we must observe that the acreage noted as now "under cultivation" includes not only the arable but the pasture land; that in all probability as large a breadth, or nearly so, is now cultivated as is likely to be, or as will really repay cultivation; and that, although only 2,535,000 acres are set down as "absolutely unimprovable," yet there is an equal area which could only be reclaimed and made available by an outlay of capital which neither is probable nor would perhaps be desirable. It appears, moreover, that although the cultivated and available acreage per head has increased *fifty per cent* during the last twenty years,—the period of Ireland's greatest improvement,—yet the allowance of cultivated land for each person is still short of *two acres and three-quarters*, and that, if every bit of land that is capable of being reclaimed at any cost were brought under cultivation, the allowance would still only reach *three acres and three-quarters*. Now, though it is true, as appears from Table III., that, comparing the *total* areas and populations of England with those of Ireland, the former would appear at first sight to be the most densely peopled of the two, yet in reality, and as a practical fact, this inference would be altogether fallacious. The *town* population of England is enormous, and the proportion which it bears to our total numbers is vastly greater than is the case in Ireland. The parliamentary *borough* population of *England* is 8,300,000 out of 19,000,000, or 44 per cent. The borough population in Ireland is 797,000 out of 5,800,000, or 14 per cent. The population in towns of 2000 inhabitants and upwards, in England and *Wales*, is 12,251,000, or 61 per cent of the whole. The population in Ireland, in towns of 1500 inhabitants and above, is 1,162,000, or only 20 per cent. The chief part of our working classes live by manufacturing or handicraft; the chief part of the Irish poor live by agriculture. In Ireland, out of 5,800,000, there are returned as actually engaged in the cultivation of the land 970,000, or 16½ per cent; in England and *Wales* the numbers thus engaged are 1,924,000, out of a total of 20,066,000, or only 9½ per cent. In order, therefore, to arrive at any thing like a fair comparison of the proportional acreage devoted to or

available for each person in the two countries, we must ascertain, and collate with Table II., the number of acres to the population in some of the most purely rural counties of England,—in some of those, that is, which most resemble Ireland in the occupations by which their inhabitants live,—*e.g.* :

TABLE IV.

Counties	Statute acres.	Population in 1861.	Acres per head.
Buckingham . . .	467,000	168,000	2·8
Hereford . . .	534,000	124,000	4·3
Lincoln . . .	1,776,000	412,000	4·3
Huntingdon . . .	231,000	64,000	3·6
Rutland . . .	96,000	22,000	4·4
York (N.R.) . . .	1,350,000	245,000	5·5
		Average .	4·3

Next, to make the comparison still more valid, let us take some of the English counties in which the proportion of agriculturists approaches most closely to that prevalent in Ireland. Now, from materials furnished by the English Census Returns (vol. iii. pp. 35 and 123, and vol. ii. p. xl.), we are enabled to calculate that, while the proportion of the *total* number engaged in agriculture in Ireland is $16\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, the proportion of those of 20 years of age and upwards so engaged is 25 per cent :

TABLE V.

Counties.	Percentage of twenty years and upwards engaged in agriculture.	Acres per head.
Essex . . .	25·3	2·6
Hertfordshire . . .	25·1	2·25
Bedfordshire . . .	25·0	2·18
Norfolk . . .	26·5	3·1
Shropshire . . .	25·8	3·45
Cumberland . . .	23·1	4·9
Dorsetshire . . .	23·9	3·35
Berkshire . . .	25·6	2·6
Oxfordshire . . .	23·2	2·7
Wiltshire . . .	29·3	3·46
Somersetshire . . .	21·7	2·38
Westmoreland . . .	30·8	8·0

The above tables afford us the means of making three comparisons, all of which point to the same conclusion. In the first place, we may compare the number of *total* acres per head in Ireland with the same proportion in those districts of England which most nearly resemble Ireland in the amount of bog, lake, and mountain or waste land they contain,—viz. Westmoreland and Cumberland. These counties give respectively 8 and 4·9 acres per head, against 3·5 in Ireland. In the next, we may compare six average agricultural counties in England (Table IV.), where nearly all the land is under cultivation, with the *cultivated* area in Ireland (Table II.). This comparison gives 2·70 acres per head for Ireland, and 4·3 in England. Lastly, we may compare (as per Table V.) those counties where the proportion of the population engaged in agriculture is as nearly as may be the same as in Ireland, viz. 25 per cent. This comparison is the most favourable of the three to the sister island, as it gives the same number of acres per head, viz. about 2·70. But when we bear in mind that the soil throughout the greater part of Ireland is less fertile than that of our purely rural districts; that the climate is decidedly worse, and, from its moisture, especially suited only to that style of culture (*i.e.* grazing) which employs the smallest amount of labour; and that our own agricultural counties are notoriously over-peopled, as shown by the low rate of wages which obtains in most of them, and by the corroborative fact of an actual diminution of numbers in *five* between 1851 and 1861,—we need not doubt the correctness of the conviction we expressed a couple of pages back, viz. that the population of Ireland is still too great for the means of comfortable subsistence which its soil affords.*

How the case may stand *a few years hence*, and whether emigration may not in one view of it be even now proceeding too fast, are, however, very different questions, and require grave consideration. It is clearly not too great *at present*; but may it not become too great hereafter? It is clearly not too great *in the aggregate*; but may it not be too great *at particular ages*? We certainly do not wish to check it now; but shall we be able to check it when we so wish?—This may well be doubted. We know how strong is the tie which binds every man, especially the uneducated man, to his native land. We know how great

* Dr. N. Hancœck (p. 4) draws attention to a point which is too often lost sight of, and which it is of the greatest importance to remember, viz. that the tendency of the population in all purely rural districts is to *diminish*, when those districts are in a healthy, prosperous, and improving condition. It is, in fact, a sign of advancement, and indicates a higher form of agriculture, amended implements, more scientific farming, and higher wages. It is as observable in France and England as in Ireland. Between 1851 and 1861, out of 631 districts in England, there was a decrease of the population in 248, these 248 being almost exclusively agricultural.

an effort is required to break this tie, and how powerful must be the inducements, of repulsion on the one side and of attraction on the other, which will cause any large number of persons to leave the home of their fathers and betake themselves for life to other shores. At the same time we must not forget that in this path, as in almost every other, *c'est le premier pas qui coûte*; that every year makes the course easier and the way broader; that every fresh batch of Irishmen who cross the Atlantic prepare the way for others, furnish them with means, and present them with a motive for following their example. Gradually, as the tide flows on, as one of a family goes and succeeds, as one set of friends after another quit the land of disappointment for the land of promise, the Irish peasant finds the balance of attraction slowly inclining in favour of the New World. He begins to perceive that he has more acquaintances and kindred *there* than *here*, and that a fresh and brighter Ireland is in process of formation on the American shore. It is not "ould Ireland," to be sure,—and that is against it; but on the other hand it is an Ireland of sure prosperity and plenty,—and that is for it. He knows that in New York and Quebec the wages of a labourer are usually 4s. to 5s. a-day, in place of the uncertain 5d. to 10d. he can obtain in Cork or Tipperary. He knows that in Canada and the States land may be bought out and out for little more than 5s. an acre in any quantity, and that his brothers and cousins have already become proprietors there, and are flourishing like green bay-trees. He hears from Mr. Bright (and probably believes) that on the easy condition of "serving the United States for a fortnight or a month," he may have 160 acres conveyed to him for a fee of ten dollars, and that he can reach this generous country in ten days at a cost of 3*l.* or 4*l.*—Now, what has Ireland to offer him in rivalry to all this if he remains? Lord Carlisle holds out to him a hope that his wages will ultimately rise to 10s. a-week; his plot of land may be a little increased, and the rent he pays for it may be a little reduced; his condition will be steadily ameliorated till he becomes as well off as the English agricultural labourer. This is really the outside that the most sanguine among us could venture to promise him; enough perhaps, had it come in time, to have prevented emigration from growing into a national habit—not enough to unform or to arrest that habit now. All difficulties are now bridged over, the stream has become steady and perennial. Since 1851, a million and a half of his countrymen are gone and are beckoning to him to follow:—70,000 went in 1862, 120,000 in 1863:—we can

* The cost of transporting a family from Ireland to New York has been much reduced. It used to be 6*l.* per head or 30*l.* a family. It is now only 4*l.* 10s. a head or 22*l.* 10s. a family. The remittances from Irishmen in America to their

spare these numbers now while the labouring population is still redundant—shall we be able to spare them year after year, when population grows too scanty? And shall we be able to stop them when we find the balance between supply and demand has been restored?

The second point for consideration relates to the age and circumstances of the mass of emigrants. It is obvious that if all or most of them belong to the breeding period of life, or to those shortly to arrive at that period, the ultimate effect on the population of the island will be very different from what it would be if a proportionate number of each age were to expatriate themselves. It is plain that if every year, for example, we were to expatriate all who arrive that year at the marriageable age, and if the child-bearing period lasts (say) for 20 years, then in the course of 20 years we should not only have stopped all natural increase of the population, but should have gone far to insure its total and rapid extinction. We may be very well able to spare 75,000 or 100,000 annually, if they consisted of the old or were taken equally from all ages; while a drain of 75,000 or 100,000, all of the age of 20, would be absolutely fatal, and would ere long amount to complete depopulation.

Now, as we have no official Registrar of Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Ireland yet, we are unable to say with absolute certainty what is the rate of *natural increase* there, *i.e.* the annual excess of births over deaths. If the same ratio prevailed there as in England, the regular annual increment would be about 75,000. We have, however, one way of estimating it with tolerable accuracy. The total amount of *emigration* to foreign shores between 1851 and 1861, was 1,160,000. To this must be added those who *migrated* for permanent residence to England and Scotland in the same decennial period, who, according to Dr. Hancock (p. 5), were 300,000. We know, therefore, that there was an artificial decrease of the population amounting to 1,460,000; the *actual* aggregate decrease we know by the Census tables was only 753,000; there must therefore, it would appear, have been a "natural increase," or excess of births over deaths, equal to the difference between these two amounts, or about 70,000 per annum.

We cannot say precisely what number of both sexes arrive annually at the marriageable age (say 20), but from the materials furnished by the Census papers, we cannot be far wrong in calculating it at about 129,000. It is plain, therefore, that, in-

friends at home have become very large. In 1847 they were estimated at 200,000. In 1848 they rose to 460,000; and in 1853 to 1,439,000. The total amount known to have thus been remitted in aid of emigration exceeds 10,000,000. (Dr. Hancock, p. 12).

cluding *migration* as well as *emigration*, a larger number leave Ireland permanently every year than arrive at the marriageable age. Unfortunately we have no regular record of the ages of the emigrants: we can therefore only guess at the aggregate result.* There is, however, every reason to believe that they consist in preponderating degree of young couples recently married, or having young families, occasionally carrying with them an aged relative. This is the impression of those who have watched the process; and the impression is to a great extent confirmed by the statistics we possess. In the first place, we find that the proportion of the residuary population at the marrying ages is smaller in Ireland than in England. Thus the proportion between *twenty and forty* years of age is 27·8 per cent in Ireland, and 30 per cent in England. In the second place, the emigrants are nearly equally divided between the two sexes. From May 1851 to December 1862, 663,301 males, and 634,526 females, left the shores of Ireland for good. In the third place, we find that, whereas (with one single exception) the population of each quinquennial division up to 55 years of age inclusive, had *decreased* considerably between 1851 and 1861, and the decrease was greatest between five years and twenty years, the population *over* the age of 55 had actually *increased*. The following are the details in round numbers.

	1851.	1861.	Increase.	Decrease.
Population under 5 yrs. old .	644,000	694,000	50,000	. .
" between 5 and 25	3,160,000	2,496,000	. .	664,000
" " 25 and 55	2,123,000	1,901,000	. .	222,000
" 55 yrs. and upwards	620,000	704,000	84,000	. .
	6,547,000	5,795,000	134,000	886,000

We cannot quite explain why the number of very young children should have increased, unless, indeed, these are left behind by their emigrant parents, or unless intending emigrants postpone their departure till their infants have completed their fifth year. But it is clear from the above table that the numbers of the old and useless are increasing both positively and

* From May 1st, 1851, to December 31st, 1855, the percentage of emigrants from Irish ports, at different ages, was as follows:

Under 1 year old	. . .	1·14 per cent.
1 year and under 10	. . .	11·76 "
10 " 20	. . .	25·97 "
20 " 30	. . .	39·75 "
30 " 40	. . .	11·18 "
40 " 50	. . .	6·69 "
50 " 60	. . .	2·77 "
60 and upwards	. . .	0·74 "

relatively, and that the principal, indeed nearly the whole, of the net decrease of the population during the last decennial period has taken place among those arriving at or approaching the marriageable age. The decrease of those between ten and fifteen years of age alone was 300,000. It is therefore useless to shut our eyes to the fact that a depopulation of Ireland, to an extent at which the residual labourers will no longer suffice for the adequate cultivation of the soil and the other demands of the labour-market, is a very probable contingency,—nay, that unless some change in existing elements take place, such a result is all but a certainty. We cannot ourselves say that we should look upon this result with much uneasiness, if the English labourer were as migratory as the Irish one, and if we could organise a Saxon influx, as soon as it became necessary, to counteract the Celtic efflux. On the contrary, we should regard such a system as the greatest blessing that could happen to the sister island, and as the crown and consummation of its cure. In the southern counties of England we have peasants enough and to spare; a migration of half a million would raise the condition and secure the future, not only of themselves but of several remaining half-millions; but unfortunately it is to be feared that whenever our Dorsetshire, or Somersetshire, or Norfolk peasant can be uprooted, he will choose to go to still brighter prospects and to more distant lands. At the same time, it might be that fifteen shillings a week, attainable in three days, might, if duly explained, be made more attractive than four shillings a day and land in fee simple at the antipodes. This, however, is a matter for future speculation and arrangement.

Looked at from an unprejudiced point of view, almost every fact relating to Ireland is fraught with encouragement, though we cannot be surprised that Irishmen read these signs of the times differently from ourselves. We have shown why we regard the depopulation of Ireland, *so far as it has yet proceeded*, with complacency rather than with uneasiness and regret. Notwithstanding the mischiefs arising from three successive wet seasons, we draw similarly hopeful auguries *on the whole* from the agricultural statistics which lie before us. For, *first*, the total number of acres under crops increased steadily from 1847 to 1860, and has only slightly diminished since. The aggregate was as follows :

1847	5,238,000
1852	5,739,000
1860	5,970,000
1862	5,751,000

That is to say, the same amount of land is under cultivation as there was ten years ago, notwithstanding a decrease in the cultivating and eating population of three-quarters of a million. *Secondly*, the acreage under green crops, for which Ireland is singularly fitted, has doubled since 1847: it was 727,000 acres in 1847, and 1,465,000 in 1862. The breadth of land under potatoes, too, is augmenting from year to year. The area allotted to hay, clover, and flax is also gradually increasing. *Thirdly*, on the contrary, the acreage devoted to the cereals, for which the wet and uncertain climate of Ireland is especially ill-adapted, has diminished. The acres under wheat have fallen from 743,000 to 358,000; the change in oats, a much less hopeless crop, has been comparatively slight,—from 2,200,000 to 1,974,000. In plain words, the cultivators of the soil in Ireland are gradually turning their attention to those crops for which it is best suited. The numbers and value of live stock have somewhat fallen during the last three bad seasons, but on the whole the increase has been very great. (Dr. Hancock, p. 43.)

1841	£21,000,000
1849	25,700,000
1853	29,150,000
1859	35,370,000
1862	31,204,000

There can be little doubt that the value of the cattle in the more recent years has been much under-estimated, as both the weight and price of Irish beasts have improved since 1844.

The first indispensable condition of returning prosperity to a country such as Ireland was before the famine, is that people should flow out of it; the second and equally indispensable condition is that capital should flow into it. Dr. Hancock has collected a number of miscellaneous indications of the extent to which this last healthy operation can be ascertained to have taken place. Thus the amount of government stock on which dividends are paid in Ireland rose from 34,730,000*l.* in 1844 to 42,217,000*l.* in 1857, and is still upwards of 38,000,000*l.* The amount of private deposits in the principal banks at the close of the year, which was 8,000,000*l.* in 1845, had risen to 10,773,000*l.* in 1852, and to 14,388,000*l.* in 1862. The miles of railway open have risen from 65 in 1845 to 1423 in 1862, and the annual receipts from 120,000*l.* to 1,448,000*l.* The amount of stock in the principal railways of Ireland held by residents in Great Britain has remained nearly stationary since 1847; that held by residents in Ireland has risen from 624,000*l.* to 3,882,000*l.* The value of property paying probate duty has

increased from 2,686,000*l.* in 1845 to 4,225,000*l.* in 1862, and is now greater than it was twenty years ago, before the potato-rot was known, and when the population was larger by two millions and a half.

It is not to be denied that the farmers of Ireland have suffered severe losses during the three consecutive bad seasons 1860-62, nor is it probable that the labouring classes have altogether escaped. Their condition, we know, is still deplorable enough, but, compared with what it was before 1846, the improvement is both great and most encouraging. Judge Longfield, than whom no man is more qualified to speak, estimates the average rise in wages between 1844 and 1856 at from 25 to 80 per cent. It has risen since then about ten per cent more, according to Dr. Hancock, and employment at the same time has become much more continuous. In 1836, the Commissioners reported that not less than 2,385,000 persons (including families) were in distress and *out of work* for thirty weeks in the year. In 1844, wages varied from 5*d.* to 8*d.* a-day in Connaught, and from 7*d.* to 10*d.* a-day in Munster and Leinster, and even at these rates employment was not constant. Now in most parts 7*s.* 6*d.* a week is quoted as an average labourer's earnings, and occupation is pretty continuous. The necessaries of life have risen somewhat: wheat not at all; oatmeal somewhat; potatoes very considerably. But the consumption of Indian meal has now become almost universal, and the effect of this food is excellent. From 1857 to 1859 the quantities imported into Ireland averaged 1,000,000 quarters; in 1861 and 1862 the average was 1,870,000 quarters. Perhaps, however, the state of pauperism is as good a test of the condition of the labourer as any other, since we know how the workhouse is detested by the Irishman, and how scantily and rarely outdoor relief is granted.

	Relieved in doors.	Relieved out of doors.	Total in receipt of relief.
1846 . . .	250,822	.	250,822
1849 . . .	932,284	1,210,482	2,142,766
1855 . . .	269,794	35,432	305,226
1859 . . .	153,706	5,425	159,131
1862 . . .	266,605	23,342	289,947

The Encumbered Estates Act was perhaps the greatest blessing which British legislation ever conferred upon the Irish people. As long as a vast proportion of the land remained in the hands of an insolvent proprietary no steady improvement could take place. Now the proportion of Irish estates that were encumbered, and the extent and complication of these

encumbrances, had reached a point which bad defiance to all ordinary remedies. An extraordinary remedy was therefore devised, the chief merit of which was due, we believe, to Sir John Romilly. In October 1849, the Encumbered Estates Court was established, with power (on petition, whether by owner or encumbrancer) to investigate titles, and sell with a clear and indefeasible parliamentary title all estates encumbered within the meaning of the statute. The existence of this court was prolonged from time to time, and in 1858 was made permanent under the name of the "Landed Estates Court;" a tribunal which can now not only sell encumbered property, but can and will investigate all titles to landed property, and give to the owner, with or without sale, an indefeasible and simple parliamentary title in lieu of his own complicated, unintelligible, and perhaps imperfect one. The Attorney-General for Ireland estimates that the effect of this system of simplified and settled titles has been to raise the value of Irish property from 5 to 10 per cent.* The amount of business transacted in the Encumbered Estates-Court from its commencement to its close is thus stated by the Solicitor-General:†

Petitions lodged	4,413
Absolute orders for sale	3,547
Number of conveyances executed	8,364
Number of Irish purchasers	8,258
<hr/>	
Gross proceeds of sales	£23,160,000
Of which was paid by Irish purchasers	20,000,000

Since this, and up to the close of January 1862, we believe that sales have been effected in the Landed Estates Court to a further amount of 5,941,000*l*.‡ The result of the whole is that upwards of 3,200,000 statute acres, or more than *one-sixth* of the entire area of Ireland, has passed from the hands of necessitous into those of solvent proprietors; while it is satisfactory to learn that a considerable subdivision of large properties has taken place, 3547 estates having been conveyed to 8364 purchasers, the proprietors of land being to all appearance increased between two and three fold.

Looking at the subject as a whole, and throwing out of consideration, as a mere temporary drawback which will soon be remedied, the bad effects of the three wet and unfortunate

* Paper by the Right Hon. James Whiteside; *Transactions of Social Science Association*, 1861, p. 158.

† "Landed Estates Court," by J. A. Lawson, Solicitor-General for Ireland; *Trans. Social Science*, 1861, p. 167.

‡ *Thom's Irish Directory for 1864*, p. 780.

years 1860-62, every thing looks promising for Ireland, with two exceptions. Agriculture is improving, and becoming more *appropriate*; the numbers of the population are year by year, and very rapidly, becoming proportioned to the yield and the requirements of the soil, capital is accumulating and flowing in; estates are becoming liberated, and insolvent, and therefore incapable, proprietors are diminishing. Two great and sad anomalies, however, remain, more deeply rooted, more potent for mischief, and more difficult to deal with, than all others: the Irish Church and the Irish people; the unmanageable, and apparent incurable, character of the population, and the indefensible nature of the ecclesiastical Establishment.

The Established Church in Ireland is, as every one knows, the church of the minority—and of a small minority. Yet it is endowed out of the land, and draws its revenue from the produce of the whole island. It is, moreover, enormously overmanned and overpaid, not indeed for the work it theoretically *has to do*, but for the work it does, and for the only work it really can do. It is neither too rich nor too numerous for the flock it has to convert and bring into the fold; but unfortunately this missionary function it neither does nor can perform; while for the flock which it actually has to minister to it is indisputably most disproportionate in every way. Certain attempts have been made to mitigate the evil and anomaly,—all in the right direction, but none of them going to the root of the matter. In 1834 the bishops were reduced one-half in number, but are still excessive. Many years later, and after severe struggles, tithes were made a rent-charge, and alleviated by at least 25 per cent. The amount was diminished, and the irritating mode of levying heretofore in vogue was abolished. Then, when the famine came, and the subsequent emigration, it was hoped that the relative numbers of Catholics and Protestants would be so far altered as to mitigate at least the scandalous disproportion. This expectation, reasonable as it seemed, has not been realised. We have four several enumerations of the adherents to the different forms of religion prevalent in Ireland—the two first mainly conjectural, the two last accurate and reliable. Thus (Irish Census Returns, part iv.):—

	1672.	1733.	1834.	1861.
Roman Catholics	800,000	1,417,000	6,436,000	4,505,000
Established Church	100,000	} 562,800	{ 853,000	633,000
Protestant Dissenters, &c. .	200,000			
	1,100,000	1,979,800	7,954,000	5,798,000

The *proportions* per cent of the several religious denominations to the total population indicated by the above is as follows:

	1672.	1733.	1834.	1861.
Roman Catholics	72·7	71·7	81·0	77·7
Established Church	9·1	} 28·3 {	10·7	12·0
Protestant Dissenters, &c. .	18·2		8·3	10·3
	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0

It would appear from the above tables that in the course of the last seventeen years the Catholic Church has lost about *three* per cent of its numerical preponderance, and that the Established Church has gained nearly half of what its great rival has lost. But the following comparison suggests how much of this unimportant modification is due to emigration:

Provinces.	Proportion of Catholics to population.	Proportion of emigrants since 1851 to population in 1841.	Proportion of emigrants to total emigration.
Leinster . .	86 per cent.	12·3 per cent.	19·51 per cent.
Munster . .	94 „	20·0 „	37·47 „
Ulster . . .	50 „	15·5 „	28·64 „
Connaught . .	95 „	10·5 „	11·44 „

The summary of the whole matter is this. Since 1834 the *percentage* of members of the Established Church has *increased* in twenty-one of the thirty-two ecclesiastical provinces into which Ireland is divided, *diminished* in nine, and remained stationary in two. In all, however, the change is trifling. The total number of members of the Established Church has fallen off by 160,000, or about 20 per cent of the whole, and their entire aggregate does not now reach 700,000 souls; while the enemy—their work, the body on whom they have to operate, the population whom, if we regard them as a missionary church, they have to convert—has been reduced by 2,000,000, or nearly *one-third*. Meanwhile the nett revenues of the Irish episcopacy are 58,000*l.* per annum, and the total income of the Established Church is 580,000*l.* Meanwhile also, among the 2428 parishes into which Ireland is divided, there were in 1861 199 containing *no* members of the Established Church, 575 parishes containing not more than *twenty*, 416 containing between *twenty and fifty*, 349 containing between *fifty and a hundred*,—in all, 1539 out of 2428 with fewer than a hundred parishioners; while only 169

parishes numbered more than 1000 members of the Established Church.

Such are the facts as to the State Church: what is the case as to the Church of the people—the Church, that is, of three-fourths of the entire population—the Church of the poorest class and of the indigenous class? The Catholic Church derives no revenue from the land, and only the scantiest subsidy from the State. It consists for the most part of fees *extorted* by the priests from their impoverished flocks, for burials, baptisms, and marriages,—in part also in voluntary contributions from the richer members of its communion. Seven hundred thousand Protestants have an endowed clergy with an aggregate income derived from land of nearly 600,000*l.*; four millions and a half of Catholics have to maintain an unendowed clergy as they best can. And in former days the chief part of the funds which now support the Protestant clergy did support and belong to the Catholic Church.

This is the grievance; this is the anomaly; this is the wrong. Can it be remedied? and how can it be remedied? It is the one wrong that remains of all that English legislation at one time had inflicted upon Ireland. It is the only real grievance of which Ireland can still complain. All her other evils at present come from the perversity of her own natives. For a long time back, Ireland has been petted in place of being oppressed. Her inflictions have been none; her exemptions have been many. Her taxes have been unfairly light; her jobs have been unscrupulously numerous and heavy. Irishmen have been placed and promoted, wherever fit Irishmen could be found; but fit Irishmen are so few. What legislation could do for Ireland, it has done—since 1829. In this way much more has been done for Ireland than for England. Has England a Landed Estates Court? The imperial conscience would be clear with reference to this discontented part of our dominions—except for the one crying grievance of the Irish Church. Pitt tried to mend matters in 1801, by the payment of the Catholic clergy out of State funds; but he was checkmated by the immovable bigotry of the narrow and incapable monarch who then sat upon the throne. The Whigs tried hard to do something from 1834 to 1839; and we all recollect how thoroughly and repeatedly they were defeated. If O'Connell had been honest enough earnestly to take up the cause of endowing the Catholic clergy instead of the cry of repeal, he might perhaps have carried his point in some form. But he was not sincere and disinterested enough for this. We suspect he dreaded the political and *pacifying* effect of paying the clergy out of State funds. The priests themselves had some misgiving as to the possible

loss of influence over their flock which might follow if the last appearance of persecution died away, and they became the comfortable and salaried servants of the nation, as in France. Can any thing in this direction be done now? We confess we are all but hopeless. We should be glad, very glad, to see the Protestant endowment handed over to the Catholic Church in all those parishes where there are not fifty or a hundred Protestants of the Establishment. But what prospect is there of now getting such a proposal listened to in a parliament mainly returned by churchmen and orthodox dissenters? We should wish to allot at least a million per annum out of the imperial (or the Irish) exchequer for the payment of the Catholic clergy. It would be only just, and it would be very cheap. But what ministry would dare to propose such a measure? What Scotch members or members for large town constituencies would dare to vote for such a moderate and equitable scheme? Who would venture to rouse the mulish and savage bigotry of English and Scotch, to say nothing of Irish, Protestantism by going to the country on such a statesmanlike proposal? What proportion of the ten-pound householders in Great Britain—what portion even of the educated and the upper classes—would not stand aghast or become furious, or affect to do so, if they were called upon to set apart a sum out of the taxation to which they contribute in order to pay the Irish Catholic clergy,—in order, that is, to maintain a Church which their ancestors robbed, and whose doctrines they even now regard with horror? “What!” they exclaim; “pay for the propagation and maintenance of religious error! Salary the teachers of Papal abominations! Actually *subscribe* to the comforting and consolidation of Romanism!” Alas! who that knows the English middle classes can entertain much hope of overcoming feelings like these? What chance has justice, though we do love it, against fanaticism, which is still so fearfully rampant among us? We see clearly what ought to be done, but we are hopeless of persuading any British Parliament to do it.

While, however, we blush for the endowment and establishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland, and for the non-endowment of the Catholic Church; while we deplore that such a valid ground of complaint and disaffection should be suffered to continue; while we believe that the removal of this injustice, as of all injustices, could not fail to be followed by beneficial results which, perhaps, we can scarcely as yet foresee,—we do not attribute much of the existing misery of Ireland to this grievance, nor do we believe that its rectification would change the character or condition of the people. It would remove a

sore : it would not remove *the sore feeling*. It might give us in the end a better educated and more respectable clergy : it would not give us a regenerated, a reasonable, a law-abiding, an un-Celtic population. It is useless to wrap up the truth in honeyed words, or to deny it impudently in braggart ones. It is in the Irish character that the perennial, and it would almost seem incurable, source of Irish wretchedness is to be sought. We are little inclined to "draw up an indictment against a whole nation," to use an expression of Edmund Burke's : still we think it is impossible for any one who reads the history of Ireland, or the accounts of Ireland given by unprejudiced visitors and residents for centuries back,—and who traces there the perpetual recurrence of the same idiosyncrasies and the same crimes under every régime and under all circumstances,—the utter blindness to the dictates of prudence and the decisions of justice,—the inability to look at any thing or any body except from a feminine and partisan point of view,—the real love and *preference* of discord, turbulence, and lawlessness,—the weakness of *reason* as compared with passion and with fancy which pervades all classes and seems to form the staple of the character,—to avoid the conclusion forced irresistibly upon the mind, that the Celtic race—that form of it, at least, which exists in Ireland—is not fitted to form a nation by itself ; that it may be, and doubtless is, a most valuable ingredient in the national life and nature ; but that as the sole or even the predominant ingredient it can never prosper. It is idle and untrue to attribute the Irish faults to misgovernment. They have existed alike, and have cropped out with nearly equal vigour, under every government except the iron rule of Cromwell. It is these very faults which promote misgovernment, which make good and just government so difficult, which would seem to make free and self-government so hopeless and impossible. "Ireland for the Irish" would be merely Ireland to the dogs. Ireland never has been so shamelessly and clumsily ill-governed as when she governed herself, or was governed by Irishmen. The history of the Irish nation since Henry VIII.,—nay, since Henry II.,—the history of the Irish Parliament before the Union, might cure all declaimers of tracing Irish misery and misfortunes to English misrule. The Protestants were as bad as the Catholics : no form of faith seemed to produce any actual modification of the *vis vivida* of the native virus of the race. The real Irish gentleman, like the real Irish peasant, was every where the same or nearly the same,—full of lovable and attractive qualities, generous, brave, and often faithful, capable of vehemence, enduring, and often most unwarrantable attachments ; but inherently and incurably *irrational*, reckless, jobbing, grasping, unprincipled, and wild. It is useless to ad-

duce proofs: the proof lies in every page of past history, as well as in the living history that is daily enacted before our eyes. Who that ever had to deal largely with Irish gentry or Irish labourers, either as official or as landlord; who that ever traced the details, or remembered them personally, of those ferocious "strikes" by which one lucrative trade after another was driven from the shores of Ireland; who that ever had large bodies of unmixed, uninoculated Irish labourers to manage; finally, what member of the British House of Commons who comes into daily contact with his Irish colleagues, who watches their instinctive course, who hears their unvarnished language, who sees their modes of thought and their principles of action, "naked and not ashamed,"—will not echo in his secret soul every condemnatory word we have written, though, of course, he will cry, "Oh, fie!" upon us for writing it?

The statistics of crime in Ireland are not pleasant to analyse. The Irish never were much given to petty larceny, and as compared with England they have not nearly so large a *professionally* criminal population. Their characteristic crimes are for the most part crimes of violence, and their worst and most peculiar crimes all partake more or less of an agrarian character. There are four bad features connected with these: the special savagery and brutality which distinguishes them; the fact that they are usually committed by persons hired for the occasion; the utter absence in most instances of any real provocation for the outrage—any plea, we mean, which, in a mind capable of distinguishing between justice and injustice, could offer any sort of warranty or palliation for the offence—the victim being usually quite innocent and often having been very forbearing, and the murderer, or the man who hired the murderer, having been usually obstinately and perseveringly in the wrong; and the frequency with which the criminal escapes detection, owing partly to the incapacity of the police, and partly to the sympathy and aid of the surrounding population. For a considerable period after the famine, notwithstanding necessarily wholesale evictions, agrarian outrages in their worst form became comparatively rare; and sanguine people who believe in the conversion of the leopard and the Ethiopian began to hope that this form of crime at least was in process of extinction: there was a Poor-Law; wages and employment were increasing, and emigration opened new hopes to the disappointed suitor for Irish land. But during the last two or three years all the old outrages have revived with more than the old atrocity. It is true that, as regards the returns of committals and convictions, there has been a gradual improvement for some time back. The number of cases tried at assizes and quarter-sessions

fell from 9012 in 1855 to 6666 in 1862, the proportion of convictions to acquittals remaining the same. But these returns are nothing to the purpose, where the complaint is that for so many offences no one is ever brought to trial at all. We find, from the charges delivered by several judges* at the assizes just terminated, that in many districts *not one-half* of the known outrages are traced or brought home; that, in fact, in two cases out of every four, crimes of the most brutal description, and those most fatal to the peace and well-being of a community, are committed with absolute impunity. We have a record of the "offences specially reported to the constabulary" for some years past—not including Dublin. These had fallen off from 10,639 in 1850 to 3492 in 1858. Since then they have steadily increased, as follows:

	1859.	1860.	1861.	1862.
Offences against person .	1399	1266	1235	1167
" " property .	1693	1703	2090	2392
" " the peace .	526	562	556	842
	3618	3531	3881	4401

The increase in the offences against the peace has been chiefly in threatening notices. The disheartening part of the matter is the reappearance of this social disease of "Ribbonism," which it was hoped had become extinct. For the great impunity which crime of this sort has secured for itself, the inefficiency of the constabulary is in the main answerable. As at present constituted, it is semi-military in its character and organisation, valuable perhaps for the maintenance of order and the repression of faction fights, rows, and insurrectionary movements, but wholly useless for the prevention or detection of crime. The constables live in detached barracks, wear uniform, are drilled and stiffened, and full, it is said, of official pretension, and more than official languor and inaptitude. They were well enough adapted for their original purpose, that of keeping the peace; but for the duties of tracking out criminals, obtaining and following out clues to murders perpetrated or projected, there appears to be but one opinion as to their utter worthlessness.† Yet the number of this force was in 1862 12,341, and

* See especially the charges of Baron Fitzgerald and Justices Keogh, Ball, and Christian. Also the speech of Lord Donoughmore in the House of Lords, March 18, 1864.

† According to Lord Donoughmore's account, which we have heard fully corroborated in many other quarters, the constabulary are not only unfit for and

its entire cost 765,428*l.*, of which 750,000*l.* was paid out of the Consolidated Fund. It is high time this evil should be looked to.

What is the conclusion of the whole matter? That Ireland is improving rapidly and steadily; that the causes of its improvement are the exodus of superfluous Irishmen, the influx of needed British capital, and the gradual substitution of a more appropriate agriculture. The measures yet wanted to carry forward and complete the regeneration of this country are: the establishment of a more efficient organisation for the detection and the punishment of crime, the payment of the Roman Catholic clergy out of those State funds which are mainly contributed by Roman Catholic tax-payers, the continued emigration of Celts, the proportionate immigration of Saxons and Scots, and, if possible, an amalgamation by intermarriage of the several races. When only half the population of Ireland shall be Catholic and Celtic, and when that half shall be not *geographically* separated from the other half; when outrages and crimes of atrocity and violence shall be habitually discovered and relentlessly punished; and when the priests, being paid and paid decently, shall be no longer necessarily either the misleaders and extortioners of their flocks nor the enemies of the established government,—then the long battle of centuries will be won; Irish blood will have become *sanified* by dilution, and Irish wretchedness and perversity sapped at its root. In one sense, and in one sense only, is England responsible for Irish misery and Irish crime: she has the power to strike at the sources of both; and it is only the exigencies of political faction, and the worse, the meaner, the unholier exigencies of religious intolerance and conceit, that will prevent her being so.

adverse to the duties of police, but in some cases actually refuse to perform them, on the plea that they would interfere with drill and appearance. What can be expected from a force where the privates are valued for pipeclay, erect carriage, ready discipline, and spotless accoutrements, and where promotion is given by competitive examination!

ART. V.—CHARLES THE BOLD.

History of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. By John Foster Kirk. Vols. I. and II. London: Murray, 1863.

WE welcome with genuine pleasure a narrative of an important portion of history by a writer who shows in no small degree the possession of real historic power. And we welcome it with still greater pleasure when we find that it proceeds from an American writer, a countryman of Mr. Prescott and Mr. Motley, a writer fully entitled to take his place alongside of them, and in some respects, perhaps, to be preferred to either. It is a matter of real satisfaction that so good an historical school should be still growing and prospering, and that untoward political events have not wholly checked its development. A very slight glance at Mr. Kirk's book is enough to show that we are dealing with a real historian, that we have before us a work of a wholly different kind from the countless volumes of superficial talk which are unceasingly poured out upon the world under the degraded garb of history. Mr. Kirk has his faults both of style and of matter. That we do not always come to the same conclusions as he does, in one of the most perplexed mazes to be found in the whole range of history, is as likely to be our fault as his. But, besides this, there are features in Mr. Kirk's style which hardly conform to the laws of a pure taste, and portions of his matter which hardly conform to the laws of accurate reasoning. Still, his merits in both ways, alike as to form and as to substance, are real and great. He has studied history in its real sources, in the chronicles and documents of the time, and in the best modern writers of the various nations concerned. His research seems to be unwearying; and in dealing with his materials, he displays, notwithstanding a certain tendency to make the best of his hero, a very considerable degree of critical power. His narratives of events and his general pictures of the time are of a very high order; it would not be going too far to say that they are first-rate. In his wider political speculations he is less happy. Long disquisitions on matters rather off his subject are needlessly brought in, and they are far from being written with the same clearness and power as the narrative portions of the book. And in his occasional references to times earlier than his own immediate subject, Mr. Kirk's accuracy is certainly not unimpeachable. Besides a few strange errors in detail, he is evidently not wholly free from those popular misconceptions which have perverted the whole early history of Germany and France. These are serious defects; but they are defects which are quite overbalanced by the sterling excellences of the work, and they in no way hinder us from

gladly hailing in Mr. Kirk a welcome recruit to the small band of real historians.

In estimating Mr. Kirk's style, it would be unfair not to take into account the fact that we are dealing not with a British but with an American writer. We use the word British by choice, as best expressing mere geographical and political distinctions; for we trust that Mr. Kirk is not one of those whose birth on the other side of the ocean leads them to despise the name of Englishmen. American literature has a special interest, as bearing on the probable future fate of the language which is still common to all men of English blood in both continents. It is quite evident that good writers and speakers in the two countries speak and write—and will doubtless long continue to speak and write—exactly the same language. The divergences of speech which may occasionally be noticed between England and America simply arise from the fact that in both countries the language is often corrupted by bad speakers and writers, and that British and American corruptions of speech do not always follow the same course. A few local expressions adapted to the several wants and circumstances of the two countries, a few words retained in one country while they have become obsolete in the other, make hardly any perceptible difference. They are only worth speaking of because half-informed people often apply the name of Americanisms to expressions which have simply dropped out of use in England, or which linger only in particular districts or among old-fashioned people. In Mr. Kirk's style it is not often that we detect any signs of the American origin of his book. Here and there indeed we find such words as "proclivities," "reliable," and the like; but these, though American corruptions of the language, have become too common among British writers to be marked as sure signs of American birth. Comparing Mr. Kirk with the two contemporaries and countrymen with whom it is most natural to compare him, we should say that his style is more vigorous than Mr. Prescott's, but in less good taste, but that it is decidedly less extravagant than the style of Mr. Motley. Mr. Kirk commonly writes, especially in his strictly narrative portions, at once with clearness and with purity; but he often runs off into needless metaphors, and now and then into strange and mean expressions. These faults however are but trifles compared with the wild exuberance of Mr. Motley's earlier volumes, an exuberance which it is only fair to say is not a little chastened down in the later ones. On the other hand, when Mr. Motley gets into any general speculations, they are commonly both sounder in themselves and more clearly expressed than the long episodes which fill up a large part of Mr. Kirk's second volume. But, on

the whole, all three are writers of whom the rising historical literature of the United States may well be proud.

We think so well of Mr. Kirk's book, and we have so much to say for ourselves upon his subject, that we are not inclined to spend more time than we can help in dwelling on his defects. Still, as we have made some general strictures, it is only fair both to ourselves and to him to make our meaning clearer by one or two examples. Large parts of the general disquisitions contained in the second and third chapters of Mr. Kirk's fourth book seem to us wanting both in force and clearness. In many places Mr. Kirk seems to us to go needlessly out of his way to grapple with earlier writers, as Hallam and Macaulay, sometimes altogether without ground. Thus Mr. Kirk tells us in a note:

"We cannot help protesting* against what seems to us the most radically false, the most pernicious in the general inferences to be drawn from it, and yet the most characteristic—inasmuch as it even runs through his literary criticisms—of the paradoxes in which Macaulay loved to indulge. Speaking of England in the reign of John, he says, 'Her interest was so directly opposed to the interest of her rulers that she had no hope but in their errors or misfortunes. The talents and even the virtues of her six first French kings were a curse to her. *The follies and vices of the seventh were her salvation.*' And so too when he comes to a later period he writes, 'Of James the First, as of John, it may be said that if his administration had been able and splendid, it would probably have been fatal to our country, and that *we owe more to his weaknesses and meannesses than to the wisdom and courage of much better sovereigns.*'" (ii. 355).

Now Mr. Kirk looks on this as contradicting a remark in his own text that the English Parliament and nation, in contradistinction to the communes and estates of the Netherlands, "seconded the enterprising spirit of their monarchs, while asserting and enlarging their own constitutional rights." Now there is here no contradiction and no paradox. What Lord Macaulay says and what Mr. Kirk says are both perfectly true of different periods of English history. Lord Macaulay is speaking of our "French Kings," of the first seven after the Conquest. And what he says of them is perfectly true. England had no interest in the aggrandisement of Henry the Second in France. For the Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine to strengthen himself at the expense of the King of Paris could in no way profit the island which he held as a sort of provincial dependency. The folly of John lost Normandy and all his other French pos-

* By the way, we cannot help protesting, in our turn, against Mr. Kirk's fashion of speaking of himself as "we" and "us." In a newspaper or review there are manifest reasons for the practice, none of which apply to a book by a single avowed author. Such a man should not talk of himself more than need be; but when he does talk of himself, he should say "I" and "me."

sessions except Aquitaine. That loss was the salvation of England. Hitherto England had been, like Sardinia and Sicily in later times, the source of the highest title, but by no means the most valued possession, of her sovereigns. But now England again became the most important part of the King of England's dominions. England had been a dependency of Anjou; Aquitaine was now a dependency of England. Before long we again see, in the great Edward, a king like Alfred or Æthelstan, reigning as a true Englishman for the glory and greatness of England. At last, under his grandson, we see a King of England waging a war of aggrandisement in France, from which England and English freedom are now in a position to reap great, though doubtless only indirect, advantage. All this was the direct result of the follies and vices of John. What Lord Macaulay says is perfectly true of the reign of John; what Mr. Kirk says is perfectly true of the reign of Edward the Third. There is no sort of discrepancy between the two statements, and, both in this and in several other places, Mr. Kirk need not have gone out of his way to pass censures on Lord Macaulay which are quite undeserved.

We mentioned occasional extravagance in the use of metaphors as a fault of Mr. Kirk's. We are therefore bound to give an example of what we mean. The following parable is quite beyond us; indeed, we suspect some confusion in the writer's mind between the shaft of a pillar and the shaft of a pit:

"The shaft of Saxon liberty, raised high and solid in a time of the deepest obscurity,—while the Continental races were still undergoing the crushing and rending of a veritable chaos,—had pierced through the supervening layers of the Norman Conquest and of feudalism, incrusting itself with glittering extraneous decorations, but preserving its simple and massive proportions; and now, in like manner, it towered above the too aspiring pretensions of royalty, reared upon other and narrower foundations" (ii. 339).

We also mentioned occasional inaccuracies and misconceptions as to earlier times as among the faults of Mr. Kirk's book. It is ludicrous to place (i. 288) the saying, "*Non Angli sed angeli*," into the mouth of Gregory the Seventh. It is hardly less so to call Citears (i. 45) the "*head of the great Carthusian order*." And such a passage as the following is utterly inaccurate in fact, and still more false in deduction:

"But the Norman sovereigns of England were not related, at least by any close affinity, to the Capetian race. They had acquired their chief possessions in France, as they had acquired the English crown, not by grant or inheritance, but by the power of their arms. They were foreigners and open enemies; their only adherents in France were secret traitors or avowed rebels; and they could not, therefore, mask

their designs against it under the pretext of serving the nation and reforming the state" (i. 3).

Now Henry the Second did not acquire his dominions in France by force of arms, but by lawful inheritance and marriage: Normandy came from his mother, Anjou from his father, Aquitaine from his wife. He was not a foreigner, but a Frenchman by blood and language; he was an open enemy only as every powerful and turbulent vassal was an open enemy; in what sense his "adherents in France"—that is, we can only suppose, the inhabitants of his French dominions—were "secret traitors or avowed rebels," we cannot in the least understand. It may be, indeed the next paragraph makes it probable, that Mr. Kirk intends this description to apply, not to Henry the Second and Richard the First, but to Edward the Third and Henry the Fifth. But the "Norman sovereigns of England" is an odd way of describing the two latter princes, and the assertion as to the origin of the dominion of the Kings of England in France remains equally inaccurate in any case.

Again, it is clear that Mr. Kirk has not thoroughly emancipated himself from that slavery to the modern map of France, and to modern French talk about "natural boundaries" and such rubbish, which leads so many people utterly astray as to the whole history of the early middle age. The fault very often consists, not in any lack of knowledge of the facts, but in lack of a power to realise what is known. We set forth in a former article* the different processes by which the Dukes, Kings, and self-styled "Emperors" of Paris have gradually drawn into their hands not only all but the whole of the old Kingdom of Western France, but also nearly the whole of the Kingdom of Burgundy, and a large portion of the Kingdom of Germany. Now many people who know all the several stages of these annexations still go through the history with a sort of vague notion that, though Lorraine, Provence, half-a-dozen other provinces, were not always French, still it was somehow in the eternal fitness of things that they should be French. Now it is really no more in the eternal fitness of things that Arles should be subject to the sovereign of Paris than that Paris should be subject to the sovereign of Arles. That Besançon should be in bondage, while Lausanne is still free, is as mere an accident as that which leaves Hamburg and Frankfort still at least nominally free, while Köln and Aachen are subject to the caprices of Herr von Bismarck. But it is hard to make people realise this, even when they know the facts. It is clear that Mr. Kirk does not thoroughly realise it, though it was most important that a historian of Burgundy

* See *National Review*, October 1860,—"The Franks and the Gauls."

should realise it. Charles the Bold dreamed of restoring the ancient Kingdom of Burgundy or, perhaps more strictly, the ancient Kingdom of Lorraine. But his biographer has very faint notions indeed about the early history of Burgundy, and the various applications of that singularly shifting name; yet these things are of real importance for understanding Charles's true position. Mr. Kirk indeed seems throughout to identify the modern Kingdom of France with the ancient monarchy of the Franks, which is far more truly to be identified with that German Kingdom which was dissolved in 1806. Thus, in introducing a really beautiful description of the County of Burgundy, he tells us how,

"After a long separation from the duchy of Burgundy, it again became subject to the same rule in the early part of the fourteenth century. It was a fief, however, not of France, but of the Empire, *though situated within the natural boundaries of France*, governed by a line of princes of French descent, and inhabited by a people who spoke the French language" (i. 47).

Here Mr. Kirk knows the facts, but he does not fully realise them. He is in a manner surprised at finding a great fief of the Empire within what, on the modern map, are the boundaries of France. As for "natural boundaries," those may of course be placed wherever one pleases; it is quite as easy, and more true historically, to call the Saone the natural boundary of France, as it is so to speak of the Rhine. The French Counts of Burgundy, one of them a reigning King of France, had come in quite lately through female succession from the descendants of Frederick and Beatrice. As for language, the County of Burgundy, like nearly the whole of the Kingdom of Burgundy, spoke a Romance language; but we greatly doubt its speaking in those days any thing that could fairly be called French. In another place we read:

"Wherever the French race existed, wherever the French language was spoken, wherever mountain or river offered a bulwark to the integrity of the French soil, there the French monarchy must seek to fix its sway and establish its supremacy. France, in distinction from all other nations or countries, aspires to uniformity and completeness. Her foreign wars, her foreign conquests, for the most part have had for their object the attainment or recovery of her 'natural boundaries.' Again and again the tide has swollen to those limits, often with a force that carried it beyond them. Again and again it has receded, leaving a margin still to be reclaimed, but bearing still the traces of a former flood" (ii. 157).

Towards the end of this passage Mr. Kirk gets so metaphorical that we hardly know what he means. But what on earth is "the French race"? Why are all sorts of Romance

dialects to be jumbled together under the name of the French language? And Elsass at least is surely not peopled by "the French race," nor did its inhabitants ever speak the tongue either of *Oc* or of *Oil*. On Mr. Kirk's principles, we must take to "rectifying" the map of Europe; and a poor look-out it will be for Brussels, St. Heliers, Neufchâtel, and Geneva.

We have now done with direct criticism, except so far as we shall have to dispute some of Mr. Kirk's views with regard to some important portions of his subject. We will only add, that of the two portions into which his history naturally divides itself, the career of Charles in France and his career in Germany, the faults of which we have had to complain appear in far greater abundance in the second portion. The French part of Mr. Kirk's story is admirably told; a few strokes of the pen would remove every blemish of which we should complain. Here he has for the most part to tell a tale about which there is little dispute, and most effectively Mr. Kirk tells it. But the German portion of Charles's history is a chaos of confusions and contradictions. Here Mr. Kirk has to appear in the character of an advocate. With the matter of his pleadings we partly agree and partly differ. But it is perfectly plain that his assumption of the advocate's character has had a very bad effect upon his manner. Taking a side strongly, he becomes excited; forced metaphors, harsh and mean expressions, misplaced sarcasms, are found tenfold as often as in the earlier parts of the book. Mr. Kirk's concluding volume has yet to appear. Let him take a warning from us in the spirit in which it is meant. He has still to tell the tale of Granson, Morat, and Nancy. That tale we have often heard from the Swiss side, and we have no objection to hear it again from the Burgundian side. But let Mr. Kirk tell it us in the style in which he has told the War of the Public Good and the War of Liège, not in the style in which he has recorded the negotiations among the powers which, at a later time, so strangely leagued together for the overthrow of his hero.

The career of Charles, as we remarked in the last paragraph, divides itself into a French and a German portion. In both alike, indeed, he is exposed to the restless rivalry of Lewis of France; but in the one period that rivalry is carried on openly within the French territory, while in the second period the crafty King finds the means to deal far more effectual blows through the agency of Teutonic hands. That Charles should thus play a part in the affairs of both countries naturally followed from his position as at once a French Prince and a Prince of the Empire; but it is certainly remarkable that his two spheres of action can be thus mapped out with almost as much chronological

as geographical precision. His position was a very peculiar one; he held the rank of one of the first princes in Europe without being a king, and without possessing an inch of ground which was not held of some superior lord. The phrase of "Great Powers" had not been invented in the fifteenth century; but there can be no doubt that, if it had been, the Duke of Burgundy would have ranked among the foremost of them. He was, in actual strength, the equal of his royal neighbour to the west, and far more than the equal of his Imperial neighbour to the east. Yet for every inch of his territories he owed a vassal's duty to one or other of them. His dominions were large in positive extent, and valuable out of all proportion to their extent. No other prince in Europe was the direct sovereign of so many rich and flourishing cities, rendered still more rich and flourishing through the long and, in the main, peaceful administration of his father. The cities of the Netherlands were incomparably greater and more prosperous than those of France or England; and, though enjoying large municipal privileges, they were not, like those of Germany, independent commonwealths, recognising only an external suzerain in their nominal lord. Other parts of his dominions, the Duchy of Burgundy especially, were as rich in men as Flanders was rich in money. So far the Duke of Burgundy had some great advantages over every other prince of his time. But, on the other hand, his dominions were further removed than those of any prince in Europe from forming a compact whole. He was not King of one Kingdom, but Duke, Count, and Lord of innumerable Duchies, Counties, and Lordships, acquired by different means, held by different titles and of different over-lords, speaking different languages, subject to different laws, transmitted according to different rules of succession, and subject to possible escheat to different suzerains. These various territories, moreover, had as little geographical as political connexion. They lay in two large masses, the two Burgundies forming one, and the Low Countries forming the other, so that their common master could not go from one capital to another without passing through a foreign territory. And even within these two great masses there were portions of territory intersecting the ducal dominions which there was no hope of annexing by fair means. The dominions of a neighbouring Duke or Count might be acquired by marriage, by purchase, by exchange, by various means short of open spoliation. But the dominions of the Free Cities and of the ecclesiastical princes were in their own nature exempt from any such processes. If the Duke of Burgundy became also Duke of Brabant, the inhabitants simply passed from one line of princes to another; no change

was involved in their laws or their form of government. But, as Mr. Kirk well points out, the Bishopric of Liège could never pass by marriage, inheritance, forfeiture, or purchase. Just as little could the Free Imperial City of Besançon. The Duke whose dominions hemmed them in could acquire them only by sheer undisguised conquest, a conquest too which must necessarily change the whole framework of government. The rights of princely government were in no way affected by the transfer, even the violent transfer, of a Duchy from one Duke to another; but the rights of the Church in one case, and the rights of civic freedom in the other, would have been utterly trampled under foot by the annexation of a bishopric or a free city. And Charles, lord of so many lordships, was also closely connected with many royal houses. In France he was not only the first feudatory of the kingdom, the Dean of the Peers of France; he was also a prince of the blood royal, with no great number of lives between him and the Crown. On his mother's side he claimed descent from the royal houses of England and Portugal: he closely identified himself with England; he spoke our language; he played an active part in our politics; he seems to have cherished a hope, one perhaps not wholly unreasonable, that, among the revolutions and disputed successions of our country, the extinction of both the contending houses might at last place the island crown upon his own brow.* Looking to his eastern frontier, to the states which he held of the Empire, he was beyond all comparison the most powerful of the Imperial feudatories. The next election might place him upon the throne of the Cæsars, where he would be able to reign after a very different sort from the feeble Austrian whom he aspired to succeed or to displace. Or, failing of any existing crown, he might dream of having a crown called out of oblivion for his special benefit. Burgundy might again give its name to a Kingdom, and his scattered Duchies and Lordships might be firmly welded together under a royal sceptre. Perhaps no man ever had so many dreams, which in any one else would have been extravagant, naturally suggested to him by the position in which he found himself by inheritance.

And now what sort of man was he who inherited so much, and whose inheritance prompted him to aspire to so much more? We wish to speak of him as he was in his better days; towards the end of his days the effect of unexpected misfortunes darkened all his faults, if it did not actually affect his intellect. We will take him as he appears in Mr. Kirk's present volumes.

* Charles, as grandson of a legitimate daughter of John of Gaunt, clearly had a better hereditary right than Henry the Seventh, the descendant of a bastard son.

Now Mr. Kirk is a biographer, and, as such, he is bound by a sort of feudal tenure to "rehabilitate," as the cant word is, the lord under whom he takes service. We do not at all blame him for trying to make out the best case he can for his hero; indeed, we can go much further, and say that, in a great degree, he successfully makes out his case. Though he is zealous, he is by no means extravagant on behalf of Charles. Though he holds, and we think with reason, that Charles has commonly had less than justice done to him, he by no means sets him up as a perfect model. He rates both his abilities and his character higher than is commonly done, but he does not set him up for an exalted genius, neither does he undertake to be the apologist of all his actions. He is satisfied with showing that a man who played an important part in an important time was neither the brute nor the fool that he has been described both by partisan chroniclers and by modern romance-writers. Even in the point where we see most reason to differ from Mr. Kirk, we have little to object to as far as regards Charles himself. In estimating the causes of the war between Charles and the Swiss, Mr. Kirk lays the whole blame upon the Confederates, and represents the Duke of Burgundy as something like an injured victim. Allowing for a little natural exaggeration, we think Mr. Kirk is fairly successful in his justification of Charles; we do not think him equally successful in his inculpation of the Confederates.

Charles was perhaps unlucky in the age in which he lived; he was certainly unlucky in the predecessor whom he succeeded, and in the rival against whom he had to struggle. It may be, as Mr. Kirk says, that he was better fitted for an earlier age than that in which he lived; it is certain that he was quite unfit either to succeed Philip the Good or to contend against Lewis the Eleventh. One can have no hesitation in saying that Charles was morally a better man than his father. He had greater private virtues, and he was certainly not stained with greater public crimes. Yet Philip passed with unusual prosperity and reputation through a reign of unusual length; while the career of Charles was short and stormy, and he left an evil memory behind him. Philip, profligate as a man and unprincipled as a ruler, was still the Good Duke, who lived beloved and died regretted by his subjects. Charles, chaste and temperate in his private life, and with a nearer approach to justice and good faith in his public dealings than most princes of his time, was hated even by his own soldiers, and died unlamented by any one.*

* Charles, to say the least, never became a national hero any where. The writers of the sixteenth century, who compiled their chronicles within his dominions, and inscribed them to his descendants, Oudegherst, Pontus Heuterus,

As in many other men, the virtues and the vices of Charles were closely linked together. He knew no mercy either for himself or for any body else. Austere in his personal morals and a strict avenger of vice in others, he probably made himself enemies by his very virtues, where a little genial profligacy might have made him friends. His home government was strictly just; his ear was open to the meanest petitioner, and he was ready to send the noblest offender to the scaffold. But such stern justice was not the way to make himself popular in those days. A justice which knows not how to yield or to forgive is hardly suited for fallible man in any age, and in that age Charles sometimes drew obloquy upon himself by acts which we should now look on as crowning him with honour. His inexorable justice refused to listen to any entreaties for the life of a gallant young noble* who had murdered a man of lower degree. In this we look on him as simply discharging the first duty of a sovereign; in his own age the execution seemed to men of all ranks to be an act of remorseless cruelty. In short, Charles, as a civil ruler, practised none of the arts by which much worse rulers have often made themselves beloved. He was chary of gifts, of praise, of common courtesy. No wonder then that so many of his servants forsook him for a prince who at least knew how to appreciate and to reward their services. And what Charles was as a ruler, he was even more conspicuously as a captain. In warfare his discipline was terrible: he imposed indeed no hardship on the lowest sentinel which he did not equally impose upon himself; but the commander who had a kind word for no one, and a heavy punishment for the slightest offence, did not go the way to win the attachment of his troops. His cruelty towards Dinant and Liège did not greatly exceed—in some respects it did not equal—the ordinary cruelty of the age; but the cold and quasi-judicial severity with which he planned the work of destruction is almost more repulsive than the familiar horrors of the storm and the sack. It was his utter want of sympathy with mankind which made Charles the Bold hated, while really worse men have been beloved. The ambition of Philip the Good was quite as unprincipled as that of his son, but it was more moderate, and kept more carefully within the bounds of possibility. The means by which he gained large portions of his dominions,

his copyist Haræus, and the like, speak of him without any sort of enthusiasm; indeed, they are full of those views of his character and actions which Mr. Kirk strongly, and often truly, denounces as popular errors.

* See the story of the Bastard of Hamaide in Barante, *Ducs de Bourgogne*, x. 116; Kirk, i. 462. The better-known tale told by Pontus Heuterus (*Rerum Burgundiacarum lib. v. cap. 5*), and worked up into the story of Rhynsault and Sapphira in the *Spectator*, whether true or false, is at least quite in character.

Holland and Hainault especially, were perhaps more blameworthy than any thing in the career of Charles, and in particular acts of cruelty and in violent outbursts of temper there was little to choose between father and son. But Philip's ambition was satisfied with now and then seizing a province or two which came conveniently within his grasp; he did not keep the world constantly in commotion; he had no longing after royal or imperial crowns, and indeed refused them when they came in his way; his rule was on the whole peaceful and beneficent, and his very annexations, when they were once effected, secured large districts from the horrors of border warfare. But Charles was always planning something, and the world was always wondering what he might be planning. He attacked and annexed so widely that it was no wonder if even those whom he had no mind to attack deemed it necessary to stand ready prepared for him. His loftiest flights of ambition were far from being so wild and reckless as they are commonly represented; his dream of a new Burgundian Kingdom was far from irrational; still less was there any thing monstrous either in a great French prince aspiring to a paramount influence in France, or in a great German prince aspiring to the Crown of the Empire. But the misfortune of Charles was that he was always aspiring after something; he was always grasping at something which he had not, instead of enjoying what he had. Neither his own subjects nor strangers were allowed a moment's peace: wars with France, wars with Liège, Gelders annexed, Elsass purchased, Neuss besieged, Lorraine conquered, Provence bargained for, were enough to keep the whole world in commotion. The ten years of Charles's reign are as rich in events as the forty-eight years of his father.

Mr. Kirk is fond of enlarging on Charles's good faith, and, for a prince of the fifteenth century, the praise is not wholly undeserved. As compared with the contemporary kings of England and France, the Duke of Burgundy may fairly pass for a man of his word.* He certainly did not openly trample on oaths and obligations like Edward the Fourth, nor did he carry on a systematic trade of secret intrigue like Lewis the Eleventh. We wait to see what Mr. Kirk will say as to the fate of the Constable of St. Paul; but the affair of Péronne, to which Mr. Kirk frequently points as an exception to Charles's general straightforwardness, strikes us as being made rather more of by him than need be. There seems at least to have been no deliberate treachery on Charles's part, though there certainly was in words a breach of the safe-conduct which he had given to Lewis. The King sought an interview of his own

* "Quod nunquam antea fecerat, ruptâ fide," says Heuter (l. v. c. 12) of the execution of the prisoners at Granson.

accord; it was to take place in the then Burgundian town of Péronne. The Duke gave the King a safe-conduct, notwithstanding any thing which had happened or might happen. While Lewis was at Péronne, Charles discovered, or believed that he had discovered, evidence that the King was plotting with the revolted people of Liège. Charles then kept him as a prisoner till he had signed an unfavourable treaty, and obliged him to accompany him on his campaign against Liège, and to witness and take a part in the utter overthrow of his allies. Here is undoubtedly a breach of an engagement: according to the letter of the bond, he should have taken Lewis safe back into his own dominions, and have declared war and pursued him the moment he had crossed the frontier. But, setting aside the literal breach of faith, to deal with Lewis as he did, to humble him before all the world, to make him follow where he was most unwilling to go, was quite in character with the stern and ostentatious justice of Charles. As a mere breach of faith, it was a light matter compared with the every-day career of Lewis himself. But what shocked the feeling of the time was for a vassal to put his suzerain lord under personal duress. To rebel against such a lord and make war upon him was an ordinary business; but for a Duke of Burgundy to treat a King of France as a prisoner was a breach of all feudal reverence, a sacrilegious invasion of the sanctity of royalty, which carried men's minds back to a deed of treason more than five hundred years old.* We cannot look upon this business at Péronne as being morally of so deep a die as the long course of insincerity pursued by Charles with regard to the marriage of his daughter. It is clear that Charles was possessed with a strong and not very intelligible dread of a son-in-law in any shape. Like many other princes, he shrank from the notion of a successor, especially when that successor would not be one of his own blood, but the husband of his daughter; one who most likely would seek in her marriage and his affinity nothing but stepping-stones to the ducal or royal crown of Burgundy. So far one can enter into the feeling; but it is clear that Charles first carried it to a morbid extent, and then made use of it for a disingenuous political purpose. He held out hopes of his daughter's hand to every prince whom he wished for the moment to attach to his interests, without the least serious intention of bestowing her upon any of them. Mary was used as the bait for Charles of Guienne, for Nicholas of Calabria, for Maximilian of Austria. Now this, though it might serve an

* As Comines says (liv. ii. c. 7), "Le Roy se voyoit logé rasibus d'une grosse tour, où un Comte de Vermandois fit mourir un sien predecesseur Roy de France." The allusion is to the two imprisonments of Charles the Simple at Péronne (928-9) by Count Herbert of Vermandois. See Richer, lib. i. c. 46, 54; Frodoard in anno; Palgrave, Normandy and England, ii. 93.

immediate end, was a base and selfish policy, which could not fail to leave, as in the end it did leave, both his daughter and his dominions without any lawful or recognised protector. The feelings alike of a father and a sovereign should have made Charles overcome his repugnance to an acknowledged successor, rather than run the risk of leaving a young girl to grapple unprotected with the turbulent people of Flanders, and with such a neighbour as Lewis the Eleventh. It is here, we think, rather than in his formal breach of faith at Péronne, that we should look for the most marked exception to that general character for good faith and sincerity which is asserted for Charles by his biographer. It is certain that he piqued himself upon such a character, and that his conduct was on the whole not inconsistent with it. The worst deeds of his later career, his treatment of the Princes of Lorraine and Würtemberg, his unprovoked attack on Neuss, his cruelties after the loss of Elsass, were deeds of open violence rather than of bad faith. Through the whole of his dealings with Austria and Switzerland there runs a vein of conscious sincerity, a feeling that his own straightforwardness was not met with equal straightforwardness on the part of those with whom he had to deal.

Where then Charles failed was that he had neither the moral nor the intellectual qualities which alone could have enabled him to carry out the great schemes which he was ever planning. Success has often been the lot of brave, frank, and open-hearted princes, who have carried every thing before them, and who have won hearts as well as cities by storm. Sometimes again it has fallen to the lot of a cold, crafty, secret plotter, like Charles's own rival and opposite. The gallant, genial René of Lorraine won the affection of subjects and allies, and recovered the dominions which Charles had stolen from him. Lewis, from his den at Plessis, established his power over all France, extended the bounds of France by two great provinces, and permanently attached the stout pikes and halberds of Switzerland to his interest. But Charles the Bold, always planning schemes which needed the genius and opportunities of Charles the Great, was doomed to failure in the nature of things. A prince, just perhaps and truthful, but harsh and pitiless, who never made a friend public or private, whose very virtues were more repulsive than other men's vices, who displayed no single sign of deep or enlarged policy, but whose whole career was one simple embodiment of military force in its least amiable form,—such a prince was not the man to found an empire; he was the very man to lose the dominions which he had himself inherited and conquered.

Of the two great divisions of the history of Charles the Bold,

his career in France and his career in Germany, the former is by far the better known. It has the great advantage of being recorded by one of the few mediæval writers—if Philip of Comines is to count as a mediæval writer—who are familiar to many who are not specially given to mediæval studies. It is a plain, straightforward tale, about which there is a little difficulty or controversy, and it is so constantly connected with the history of our own country as to have special attractions for the English student. The German career of Charles is very differently situated. One or two facts in it, at least the names of one or two great battles, are familiar to the whole world; every one can point the moral how the rash and proud Duke was overthrown by the despised Switzer at Granson, at Morat, and at Nancy. But the real character and causes of the war are, for the most part, completely unknown or utterly misrepresented. In fact, no part of history is more thoroughly perplexing than this: the original sources are endless; the inferences made from them by later writers are utterly contradictory; and neither the original sources nor their modern commentators are at all familiar to English students in general. It is easy to see how little Englishmen in general know of the history of these events by the impression, which we believe is a prevalent one, that Mr. Kirk has put forth a new view about the war between Charles and the Swiss. His view has, as far as we know, never before been set forth in an English dress; but on the Continent, especially in Switzerland itself, it is far from new. It has long ago been set forth with great earnestness, and disputed against with equal earnestness. And this fact, we cannot help saying, has not been announced with sufficient plainness by Mr. Kirk. We do not mean that he does not refer to the writers of whom we speak. We are not aware that he has concealed a single name that he ought to have mentioned; to some indeed his references are very constant throughout; but it is hardly enough, in such a case as this, merely to refer to writers of whom most English readers never before heard. It is always a gain to introduce any writer to whom you have largely to refer with some account of his age, subject, and merits. But it becomes a duty to do so when such a writer largely forestalls the matter which you are yourself about to give to the world.

We think, then, that we shall be doing our readers more service if we pass lightly over the earlier and better known years of Charles's history, and give as much space as we can to the perplexing story of his relations to Switzerland, Austria, and the Empire.

Charles succeeded to the ducal crown in 1467; but his prac-

tical reign may be dated from a point at least two years earlier, when the old age and sickness of Philip threw the chief management of affairs into his hands. What we have called his French career lasts from this point till 1472. During this period, with the single exception of his wars with Liège, his field of action lies almost wholly within the kingdom of France, and though Liège lay within the Empire, it had at this time a closer practical connexion with France than with Germany. Charles's French dominions consisted mainly of the Duchy of Burgundy and the Counties of Artois and Flanders, the last being strictly a French fief, though circumstances have always tended to unite that province together with some of its neighbours into a system of their own, distinct alike from France and from Germany. There was also that fluctuating territory in Picardy, the towns on the Somme, so often pledged, recovered, ceded, and conquered within the space of so few years. These possessions alone made him the most powerful of French princes, to say nothing of the fiefs beyond the kingdom, which helped to make him well nigh the most powerful of European princes. As a French prince, we find him the leader of a coalition of French princes against their common suzerain. The object of Lewis was to make France a compact monarchy; the object of Charles and his fellows was to keep France as nearly as might be in the same state as Germany. But when the other French princes had been gradually conquered, won over, or got rid of in some way or other by the crafty policy of Lewis, Charles remained no longer the chief of a coalition of French princes, but the personal rival, the deadly enemy, of the French King. As Mr. Kirk truly says,

"The career of Charles the Bold naturally divides itself into two periods. During the first he was chiefly engaged in attempts to undermine the French monarchy. The second period was occupied with efforts to establish a power which should rise beside and overtop that monarchy" (ii. 142).

The object of Charles now was, not to weaken the French monarchy in the character of one of its vassals, but to throw it into the shade, to dismember, perhaps to conquer it, in the character of a foreign sovereign. For this end probably, more than for any other, he sought to be King of the Romans, King of Burgundy, King of England. For this end he strove to gather together province after province, so as to form his scattered territories into a kingdom greater than that of France. As he had found that the French monarchy was too strong for him in his character of a French vassal, he would no longer be a Frenchman at all. He felt no longer as a prince of the House of Valois; he fell back on his ancestors by the mother's side, and spoke of himself sometimes as Portuguese, sometimes as English.

To curb and weaken the now hostile and foreign realm he would form a state which should completely hem it in from the North Sea to the Mediterranean. That is to say, he would revive the ancient Kingdom of Lorraine,* as it stood at the first great division of the Empire of Charles the Great. And undoubtedly it would have been for the permanent interest of Europe if he had succeeded in his attempt. It would be one of the greatest of political blessings if a Duke or King of Burgundy or Lorraine could suddenly appear now. A strong independent power interposed between France and Germany† would release the world from many difficulties, and would insure the world against many dangers. It would in fact accomplish, in a much more thorough-going way, the objects which modern statesmen have tried to accomplish by guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, Switzerland, and Savoy. How vain such guaranties are the experience of the last few years has taught us. But the kingdom which Charles dreamed of, had it been held together long enough to acquire any consistency, would have needed no guaranty, but would have stood by its own strength. Such a state would, indeed, have had two great points of weakness, its enormous extent of frontier‡ and the heterogeneous character of its population. But German and Italian neighbours would hardly have been more dangerous to Burgundy than they have been to France, and such a Burgundy would have been far better able to resist the aggressions of France than Germany and Italy have been. The inhabitants would certainly have been made up of very discordant elements, but they would have been less discordant than the elements to be found in the modern "empire" of Austria, and they would have had a common interest in a way that the subjects of Austria have not. Perhaps, indeed, a common interest and a common government might, in course of time, have fused them together as closely as the equally discordant elements in modern Switzerland have been fused together. Any how, the great dream of Charles, the formation of a barrier power between France and Germany, is one which, if it only could be carried out, would be most desirable for Europe to have carried out. Statesmen of a much later age than Charles the Bold have

* Charles, of course, aimed at restoring a kingdom of *Burgundy*, not of *Lorraine*; but the extent of the dominions which he either actually possessed or is believed to have aimed at, would answer very nearly to the ancient kingdom of Lorraine, while it would far surpass the extent of any of the successive kingdoms of Burgundy, of none of which did the Netherlands form any part. In fact, the County of Burgundy is the only ground common to Charles's actual dominions and to the later Burgundian kingdom. His dominions in Picardy and Elsass lay beyond the limits of either Burgundy or Lorraine in any sense.

† "Ut inter Germanos Francosque medius imperans, utrisque terrorem incuteret." Heuter. l. v. c. 11.

‡ On this point see Johannes von Müller, b. iv. c. 8, note 469.

dreamed of the kingdom of Burgundy as the needful counterpoise to the power of France. But though the creation of such a state would be highly desirable now, it does not follow that it was desirable then, still less that any prince or people of those days could be expected to see that it was desirable. With the map of Europe now before us, it seems madness in Switzerland, or in any other small and independent state, to league itself with France and Austria to destroy a Duke of Burgundy. That is to say, it is very easy to be a Prometheus after the fact. But neither princes nor republics can be expected to look on so many centuries before them. Austria was in those days the least threatening of all powers. Its sovereigns were small German Dukes, who had much ado to keep their own small dominions together. In fact, the Duke of Austria with whom we have to do was only a titular Duke of Austria; his capital was not Vienna, but Innsbruck; his dominions consisted of the County of Tyrol and the Swabian and Alsatian lordships of his house. And it would have been only by a miraculous foresight of which history gives few examples that a citizen of Switzerland or of any other country could have perceived that France was a power really more dangerous to the liberties of Europe than Burgundy was. Lewis seemed to have quite enough to do to maintain his power in his own kingdom, while Charles seemed to ride through the whole world, going forth conquering and to conquer. In this case, as in all others, we must try to throw ourselves into the position of the times, and not to judge of every thing according to the notions of our own age. The warning is important, because by some writers,* though not very conspicuously by Mr. Kirk, it is made part of the case against the Confederates, that they helped to destroy a power which was really useful to them as a check upon France. This, as we have said, is perfectly true in a modern European point of view; but the Swiss of the fifteenth century could not see with the eyes of the nineteenth century. And valuable as a kingdom of Burgundy would have been in an European point of view, it is by no means clear that it would have been equally valuable in a Swiss point of view. Indeed, it is hard to see how its existence could have been consistent with the retention of Swiss independence in any shape.

We have thus reached the great point of controversy,—the origin of the famous war between Charles the Bold and the Swiss. As we before said, the popular conception of this war is simply that Charles, a powerful and encroaching prince, was overthrown in three great battles by the petty commonwealths

* As, for instance, in the additional notes signed D. L. H. in the French translation of Müller's History of Switzerland.

which he had expected easily to attach to his dominion. As the scenes of two of these battles lie within the modern boundaries of Switzerland, people fancy that the warfare of the Swiss was purely defensive, that they were fighting on their own soil against a foreign invader. In short, Granson and Morat are placed side by side with Morgarten and Sempach. Such a view as this implies complete ignorance of the history; it implies ignorance of the fact that it was the Swiss who made war upon Charles, and not Charles who made war upon the Swiss; it implies ignorance of the fact that Charles's army never set foot on proper Swiss territory at all, that Granson and Morat were, at the beginning of the war, no part of the possessions of the Confederation. To those who go a little further into the matter the war appears, though not immediately defensive, to have been in every way justifiable in right and in policy; it is held to have been provoked, though not by actual invasion on the part of Charles, yet by various wrongs and insults at the hands of his officers, and by the cruellest oppression inflicted on a neighbouring and allied people. In this view, the Swiss, in beginning the war, simply took the bull by the horns, and attacked a power which was on the very point of attacking them. The agency of the King of France is too plain to be altogether kept out of sight; but his interference would be held to be confined to merely fomenting a quarrel which had already arisen, and aiding—after his peculiar fashion—the Confederates in a struggle in which he had the deepest possible interest, but which would have taken place equally had he not existed.

Something like this, we imagine, would be the notion of most of those who, without having examined very minutely into details, have yet a knowledge of the history somewhat deeper than mere popular talk. Those who are used to look at the matter in this light will certainly be somewhat amazed at the way in which the story is told by Mr. Kirk. It is rather unlucky that Mr. Kirk breaks off his narrative at a critical point, namely, at the Swiss declaration of war in October 1474. One might have thought that, after having brought the career of his hero so near to its end, it would have been better to delay the publication of any part of the work till the completion of the third volume would have allowed of the publication of the whole. However, as it is, we have before us Mr. Kirk's account of the origin of the war, but for his account of the war itself we have to wait awhile. In his view—a view not really new, though doubtless new to most of his readers—Charles was wholly in the right, and the Confederates wholly in the wrong. Charles had no hostile intentions towards the Confederates, but was full of the most friendly dispositions towards them. The

mass of the Swiss people had as little wish to quarrel with Charles as Charles had to quarrel with them. The alleged grounds of complaint were either matters with which the Swiss had no concern, or else mere trifles which the Duke would have at once redressed on a frank understanding. The war was wholly the device of Lewis of France, who thought it would be more convenient to overthrow his great adversary by the arms of the Swiss than by his own. He bribed and cajoled certain citizens of Bern, Nicholas von Diessbach at their head; they gradually won over by the same arguments, first their own city and then the rest of the League. The Swiss were thus gradually led into a disgraceful treaty which made them the pensioners of France, into an unnatural alliance with their old enemy of Austria, into complicity in the infliction of a deadly wrong on the Duke of Burgundy in the seizure and execution of his governor Peter von Hagenbach, and lastly into an open declaration of war against an old neighbour and ally who had never done or intended them any wrong. The war against Charles was so far from being defensive that it was utterly unprovoked; it was not even a war of policy; it was a war in which the Swiss appeared merely as the "hired bravos" of a power which had corrupted them. The victories of Granson, Morat, and Nancy may be glorious as mere displays of valour, but they were unrighteous triumphs won in a cause in which the victors had no interest; instead of being classed with Sempach and Morgarten, they ought rightly to be classed with the displays of Swiss mercenary valour in later times, when the Confederates were simply serving as hirelings in the armies of foreign princes.

We believe that this is a fair exposition of the view which Mr. Kirk now brings, as far as we know, for the first time before English and American readers. But it is a view which, as we have before said, is far from being unknown in Switzerland itself. It was first propounded by the late Baron Frederick de Gingins-la-Sarraz, a Vaudois scholar who had specially devoted himself to the antiquities of Burgundy, in all the many senses of that wandering name. His papers on the subject will be found reprinted as an Appendix to the sixth and seventh volumes of M. Monnard's French translation—not a very accurate translation, by the way—of Johannes von Müller's great History of the Swiss Confederation. A view setting forth some of the same points, though widely differing on others, is maintained by John Caspar Zellweger of Trogen in Appenzell, in a most elaborate essay,* followed by a large collection of un-

* "Versuch die wahren Gründe des burgundischen Krieges aus den Quellen darzustellen und die darüber verbreiteten irrigen Ansichten zu berichtigen."

published documents, printed in the fifth volume of the *Archiv für Schweizerische Geschichte* (Zürich, 1847). It is not for us to guess how many of Mr. Kirk's readers, British or American, are likely to have read Zellweger or De Gingins, or even Johannes von Müller himself. For our own part, we are bound to confess that, though we have read all three, and somewhat besides, yet there is a great deal beyond which we have not read. Swiss historical works, both original authorities and modern writers, are not very common in England, and cannot always be got at a moment's notice. And the best authorities for this period consist of documents, documents too, as must always happen in a Confederation of small states, scattered about in all manner of local archives. Each fresh writer brings forth some paper which nobody had seen before, and by its help he crows over the mistakes of those who were unlucky enough to write without having seen it. Zellweger has done a real service by printing his documents at full length, while other writers merely give references which are little better than a mockery, or extracts which make us wish to see the context. Of the chroniclers of the time and of a few generations later—these last being not without value as showing the traditional view of things—we have been able to refer to a few, but to far fewer than we can wish, to far fewer than have been studied by Mr. Kirk. Etterlin, Edilbach, the two Schillings, Knebel, Valerius Anshelm, are writers on which we can lay our hands in few English libraries. The great work of Giles Tschudi stops just too soon; Stumpf and Stettler are too late to be more than witnesses to tradition; the only contemporary writers whom we happen to have at hand are the anonymous continuator of Königshoven* and the Chronicle of Diebold Schilling of Luzern.† We are therefore driven to rely in a great degree on the modern writers whom we have spoken of, and on the documents which they cite. No reader probably would wish us, even if we had the space, to go minutely through every disputed point of detail. We will confine ourselves to setting forth the general conclusions to which we have come, and to pointing out a few considerations which seemed to have escaped Mr. Kirk's notice.

First of all, it is as well to point out the extent and position of Switzerland at that time. Here, as every where, we must emancipate ourselves from bondage to the modern map. We are accustomed to conceive Switzerland as including Geneva,

* Die Älteste Teutsche so wol allgemeine als insonderheit Elsassische und Strassburgische Chronike von Jacob von Königshoven, Priester in Strassburg. Strassburg, 1698.

† Diebold Schillings des Lucerners Schweizer-Chronik., Luzern, 1862. This Chronicle, which Mr. Kirk seems not to have seen, must be distinguished from that by Diebold Schilling of Bern, which he often quotes.

Basel, and Chur at its different corners, and as being a perfectly independent power, quite distinct from Germany. We are also accustomed to point to Switzerland as the most remarkable example of a country where diversity of blood, language, and religion does not hinder the existence of a common feeling of nationality. We are also accustomed to look upon Switzerland as a power conservative but not aggressive, and on the Swiss as a people who are as ready as of old to defend themselves if attacked, but who have neither the will nor the means to annex any of the territory of their neighbours. Such is the Switzerland of our own time, but such was not the Switzerland with which Charles the Bold had to deal. Indeed, in those days the name of Switzerland, as a distinct nation or people, was hardly known. The names "Switenses," "Switzois," "Suißes," were indeed beginning to extend themselves from a single Canton to the whole Confederation; but the formal style of that Confederation was still the "Great (or Old) League of Upper Germany"—perhaps rather of "Upper Swabia."* That League was much smaller than at present, and it was purely German. It consisted of eight German districts and cities, united, like many other groups of German cities, by a lax Federal tie, which tie, while other similar unions have died away, has gradually developed into a perfect Federal Government, and has extended itself over a considerable non-German territory. The League then consisted of eight Cantons only—Zürich, Bern, Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, and Glarus. All these States were practically independent Republics; in theory they were immediate subjects of the Emperor, holding certain large franchises by ancient grant or prescription. Moreover, the League was looked on as an eminently advancing, not to say aggressive power; it was always extending its borders, always acquiring new allies and subjects in various relations to the older Cantons. Bern, above all, was always conquering, purchasing, admitting to citizenship, in a way which affords a close parallel to old Rome. The League was feared, hated, or admired by its neighbours according to circumstances; but it was a power which all its neighbours were glad to have as a friend rather than as an enemy. But as yet, with all its advances, the League itself had not set foot on "Welsh"—that is, Romance-speaking—ground. Neuchâtel, Geneva, Vaud, even Freiburg, were not yet members or even allies of the Confederation, though some of them stood in close relation to the particular Canton of Bern. All these are

* *Liga vetus Alemanniæ altæ* (Treaty with Charles VII., ap. Zellweger, 75). *Domini de Liga Alamanie* (ib. 130). *Domini de Liga magna Alamanie superioris* (i. 132). "Allemannia" might either mean Germany in general or Swabia in particular; in either case, "Upper Allemannia" is opposed to the "Lower Union" of the cities on the Rhine.

points which must be carefully borne in mind, lest the history be misconceived through being looked at through too modern a medium. Above all, the strictly German character of the League, and its close relation to the Empire, must never be allowed to pass out of mind. Mr. Kirk seems hardly to realise how thoroughly German in feeling as well as in speech the Swiss Cantons still were. The German national spirit breathes strongly in the Swiss Chronicles; the war is a national war between "Teutsch" and "Welsch;" the Confederate troops are constantly joined with those of Austria and the Free Cities, under the common name of Germans, in a way which would hardly be done by any Swiss writer now. As to their relations to the Empire, we have the manifest fact that the Imperial summons is put prominently forward in the Swiss declaration of war against Burgundy. The Confederates make war upon Duke Charles at the bidding of their gracious lord the Emperor of the Romans. Mr. Kirk rather sneers at this, and asks whether the Swiss were on all other occasions equally obedient to the orders of the Chief of the Empire. Now we certainly do not believe that mere loyalty to any Emperor, least of all to such an Emperor as Frederick the Third, would have led the Swiss into a war to which they were not prompted by nearer interests. But it does not at all follow that the prominence given to the Imperial summons was mere pretence. The Swiss, like the other members of the Empire, had little scruple in acting against the Emperor when it was convenient to do so; still it was a great point to have the Imperial name on their side whenever they could; it gave a formal legitimacy to their doings, and doubtless really satisfied the consciences of many who might otherwise have hesitated as to the right course. And in truth the relations of the Swiss to the Empire had commonly been very friendly. Certain Emperors and Kings of the Austrian House, Frederick himself among them, had indeed been guilty of wrongs against the Confederacy, but in pursuit not of Imperial but of Austrian interests. But with Emperors of other lines the League had commonly stood well; the war of Charles the Fourth against Zürich is the only important exception. The great Fredericks,* Henry the Seventh, Lewis of Bavaria, and Sigismund, had always been on the very best terms both with the old Forest Cantons and with the more extended League. There can be no doubt that the name of Cæsar still commanded a deep reverence throughout the Cantons, which died away only as the Imperial title sank into merely one of the elements of

* Of course in their day the extended League did not exist. But the three original Cantons were doubtless already bound together by that traditional tie which later written engagements only confirmed; and the Swabians of those Cantons were among the most devoted supporters of the great Swabian Cæsars.

greatness in the dangerous House of Austria. It is evident that, in the war with Charles, the Swiss, though certainly never forgetting their own interests, sincerely felt that they were fighting for German nationality and for the majesty of that Empire with which German nationality was so closely identified. That the Emperor himself, when he had once stirred them up, disgracefully left them in the lurch proves nothing as to the original feeling; when their blood was once up, they were not likely to turn back for King, Cæsar, or Pontiff.

In fact, this German character of the war, this old controversy between "Teutsch" and "Welsch," has not been without influence on the present controversy itself. The Baron de Gingins, by modern political arrangements a Swiss citizen, but by descent and feeling an old Savoyard noble, writes much as a Savoyard or Burgundian noble might have written at the time. His ancestors had fought in the war, not on the Swiss but on the Burgundian side; his own castle of La-Sarraz had been burned by the invading Germans. And these events of the fifteenth century have their influence on the writings of the historical inquirer of the nineteenth. We do not mean that De Gingins is intentionally unfair; we have no reason to believe him so; but he takes a side, and that side is not the Swiss side. He writes in a different way from Johannes von Müller, just as a Frenchman and an Englishman write in different ways about the campaigns of Henry the Fifth.

But the feelings of German nationality and of loyalty to the Empire, though they were elements in the case which must not be left out, were certainly not the moving causes of the war between Charles and the Confederates. They might well turn the balance with those who were doubtful, but they were not the things which stirred up men's minds in the first instance. What, then, was the character of the war? We have seen that it was not a war of the Morgarten type, a war of pure defensive heroism. Was it, then, as De Gingins and Mr. Kirk would have us believe, a war of mere brigandage, an ungrateful attack upon an old friend under the influence of the bribes of a concealed enemy? Or shall we, with Zellweger, look upon it as a war which was brought about by the corrupt intrigues of Lewis the Eleventh with Nicholas von Diessbach, a war in which the Confederates generally were deluded by these crafty men, but one in which they themselves could not be fairly looked upon as wanton aggressors?

This last view is one which seems to us to come much nearer to the truth than Mr. Kirk's; indeed, we should be disposed to go a little farther on behalf of the Confederates than Zellweger seems disposed to do. It seems to us that the war was no more a war

of pure brigandage than it was a war of pure defensive heroism. It was rather, like most other wars, a war of policy—whether of good or of bad policy is another question; a war which had something to be said for it and something to be said against it, a war which an honest man might advocate, and which an honest man might oppose. It seems to us, like most other wars, to have had its origin in a combination of causes, none of which alone would have brought it about. The money of King Lewis was doubtless one important element among others; but we do not believe that it was the sole determining cause.

Putting then out of sight for a moment the question of French influence in the business, had the Old League of Upper Germany any good reason for making war upon the Duke of Burgundy? It seems to us that they had as good grounds for war as nations commonly have for wars which are not purely defensive; but it also seems to us that the quarrels which formed the ostensible *casus belli* would easily have been made up by a frank understanding between the parties, if it had not been the interest of other powers to foment their differences.

There can be no sort of doubt that Charles had no immediate intention of attacking the Swiss. Indeed, whatever were his ultimate intentions, it was clearly his interest to keep on good terms with them while he was prosecuting his other conquests. It is also clear that the great mass of the Confederates had no sort of wish to quarrel with Charles. His father Philip had been an old friend and a good neighbour; and, whatever we say of Hagenbach, Charles personally had certainly done the Confederates no actual wrong. But it does not follow from this that peace was the best policy, or that the war was without excuse.

Two questions here arise. First, was the general position of Charles really threatening to the Confederates, so as to make it good policy to attack him while he could still be attacked in concert with powerful allies, instead of waiting merely to be devoured the last? Secondly, were there any particular acts on the part of Charles which, apart from these more distant considerations, rendered immediate hostilities justifiable?

On the former ground, the advocates of war could make out at least a very plausible case. Charles was, by various means, annexing province after province, in a way which pointed to settled schemes of annexation which put all his neighbours in jeopardy. He had annexed Gelders, he had annexed Elsass; he was clearly aiming at uniting his scattered dominions by the annexation of Lorraine; he was besieging Neuss, a German town, in a quarrel with which he had not the least concern, in a dispute about the rightful possession

of the Archbishopric of Cologne,*—a question surely to be judged at the tribunal of the Emperor or the Pope, and not to be decided by the arms of the Duke of Burgundy. All these were facts known to all the world. All the world knew also how Charles had, in 1473, gone to Trier, with a crown and sceptre ready made, to be raised by the Emperor to the rank of King of some kingdom or other, and how, when every thing was ready for the ceremony, Cæsar Augustus had suddenly decamped, and had left the Duke to pack up his crown and sceptre and go home again. More lately, there were rumours, true or false, that the restoration of the kingdom was designed again, that Charles was to be Imperial Vicar throughout the old Burgundy, that the Free Imperial City of Besançon was to become his capital, that he was negotiating with Good King René for the cession or inheritance of Provence. All these things were enough to frighten any body, especially those who dwelt within the limits which would naturally be assigned to the revived kingdom. The original Cantons, indeed, lay without the borders of Burgundy in any sense; but Bern and her allies of Solothurn and Freiburg all stood on old Burgundian soil, and they were far from being forgetful of the fact.† The reëstablishment of the Burgundian kingdom would thus, if it did not altogether destroy the Confederation, at least dismember it, despoil it of its greatest city, and give the eastern Cantons a powerful foreign King, instead of one of their own Confederates, as their western neighbour. Any serious prospect of such a change was enough to alarm the whole Confederacy; the least hint of the possibility of such a thing was surely enough to alarm Bern. Bern then, more directly threatened, and better versed than her sisters in the general politics of the world, naturally took the lead in the movement. That the older Cantons lagged behind is nothing won-

* Charles's policy with regard to the See of Cologne seems to be the same as his earlier policy towards Liège. As he could hardly annex the Bishopric to his dominions, his object was to convert the ecclesiastical sovereign into his instrument. Charles, however, is said to have meditated the annexation by imperial authority of the four great ecclesiastical principalities which intersected his dominions in the Netherlands, the Bishoprics of Utrecht, Liège, Cambray, and Tournay. Heuter. lib. v. c. 8.

†

“Als Krone im Burgundenreich,
Als freier Städte Krone,
Als reiner Spiegel, der zugleich
Ganz mal-und mackel ohne:
Wird Bern gerühmt allüberall
Von Jungen wie von Greisen,
Auch muss den grossen Heldensal
Das ganze Deutschland preisen.”

Lied über die Gugler, 1376, in Rochholz's *Eidgenössische Lieder-Chronik* (Bern, 1842). It is much to be regretted that the compiler of this collection should have modernised the language of the old songs in the way that he has done.

derful: Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden were far less directly threatened, and their position and manner of life naturally hindered them from keeping so keen an eye on the general politics of the world as the astute and polished statesmen of Bern. That Bern therefore was eager for war, while the other Cantons somewhat unwillingly followed her lead, was just what the circumstances of the case would naturally lead us to expect. The alliance with Austria was a necessary part of any scheme of hostility against Burgundy. It of course offended all Swiss traditional sentiment: Austria had up to this moment always been their enemy, while Burgundy had long been their friend, and had only ceased to be so under Austrian influence. But such a feeling was purely sentimental. If Burgundy was really dangerous, Austria was a natural ally. Sigismund, far too weak to do the Swiss any mischief by himself, was yet strong enough to give them valuable help against a common enemy.

The particular grievances alleged against the Burgundian Government were just of that sort which can be easily got over when both parties are so disposed, but which easily lead to war when the mind of either side is exasperated on other grounds. That the Swiss had real grievances cannot be denied: their merchants had been seized, the Bernese territory had been violated, their allies of Mühlhausen had been attacked. We cannot doubt that Peter von Hagenbach had used violent and insulting language towards the Confederates. But, except the attack on Mühlhausen, none of these were Charles's own acts; for the affair of Mühlhausen he had an excuse which might seem just to himself, though it hardly would seem so to the Confederates; for the acts of Hagenbach and others he was quite ready to make reasonable atonement. But it was not the interest of France, it was not the interest of Bern, it was perhaps not the more remote interest of the whole League, that such atonement should be accepted.

We freely grant to Mr. Kirk that the execution of Hagenbach was a breach of the law of nations. Whatever were his crimes, neither the Duke of Austria, nor the Confederates, nor the Free Cities of the Rhine, had any sort of right to judge him. He was an officer of the Duke of Burgundy, in a country of which the Duke of Burgundy had a lawful, though only a temporary, possession. His deeds, if left unpunished, might form a *casus belli* against his master; we might be inclined to shut our eyes if he had perished in a popular tumult; but his solemn judicial trial was a mere mockery of justice. But it is quite in vain that Mr. Kirk attempts to whitewash the man himself. His resolute and Christian end, acknowledged by his bitterest

enemies,* proves very little. Men often die well who have lived ill. And Hagenbach at least knew that he was dying by an unjust sentence. But the genuine and bitter hatred of all the Alsatian and Swabian towns could not have been excited for nothing. The whole people of Breisach were not in the pay of King Lewis, nor had they all been led astray by the eloquence of Nicholas von Diessbach. The fact is plain; they revolted against a cruel, lustful, and insolent ruler. The particular stories in Königshoven and elsewhere may perhaps be lies, or at any rate exaggerations; but even slander has some regard to probability. The real actions of Hagenbach must have been very bad for people to invent such stories about him. The particular grounds of indignation were just those which do most stir up men's indignation, namely, lustful excess combined with violence and insult. It is quite in vain for Mr. Kirk to soften down the stories of Hagenbach into his being merely "a man of immoral life." People do not rise up against mere immorality in a ruler; it sometimes even makes a ruler more popular. Philip the Good, Sigismund of Austria, Edward of England, the pious king of France himself, were all men of immoral life; but we do not find that any body revolted against them on that account.† This was because, whatever their moral offences, they at least abstained from those peculiarly galling forms of vice which brought destruction on Peter von Hagenbach and on the victims of the Sicilian Vespers.

As we grant to Mr. Kirk the unlawfulness of the execution of Hagenbach, we can also grant to him another point. The decisive point, one may say, of the struggle was when Sigismund of Austria reclaimed the lands in Elsass which he had pledged to Charles. We admit that the repayment of the money—the *Pfandschilling*, as the old chroniclers call it—was made in a way not contemplated in the treaty, and that Charles was therefore justified in treating the redemption as a nullity. But we think that this admission leaves the main case very much as it stood before. The important point is the zeal with which the various towns helped to subscribe the money, and their anxiety to have Sigismund for their master or neighbour rather than Charles. Mr. Kirk tells us—and we are ready to believe it—that the Burgundian government was stricter and more regular than the Austrian, and that the towns simply stood out for franchises which were inconsistent with the general good.

* See Schilling of Luzern, p. 65.

† Unless, indeed, we accept that version of the quarrel between Warwick and Edward which attributes Warwick's bitterness against the King to an insult offered by him to the Earl's daughter or niece. If so, we are approaching the same ground as the tales of Hagenbach. As a general rule, Edward's gallantries seem rather to have made him popular than otherwise.

So possibly they were; but it would have been hard to make the citizens of those towns think so. At any rate, we may be quite sure that people did not mingle their political cries with their Easter hymns without some good reason.*

We hold, then, that, taking all these things together,—the generally dangerous designs of Charles, the particular wrongs done by Hagenbach and others, the oppression of neighbouring and friendly commonwealths, the summons to the Confederates in the name of the Emperor,—there would be quite enough to explain and even to justify the Swiss declaration of war. And the peculiar position of Bern fully explains and justifies her eagerness and the backwardness of the other Cantons. All that did happen might possibly have happened, even though the gold and the intrigues of King Lewis had played no important part in the business. But we are far from denying that they did play a very important part. They clinched, as it were, the whole matter. They made that certain which otherwise would have been only possible; they hastened what otherwise might have been delayed; they made a quarrel irreconcilable which otherwise might have been made up, at least for a season. We do not doubt that the finger of Lewis was to be traced every where, at Bern, at Innspruck, in the Alsatian towns, seizing opportunities, removing difficulties, aggravating what needed to be aggravated, and softening what needed to be softened. We do not doubt that the Confederates were made the tool of a policy which few among them understood, except the special agents of Lewis. All that we say is that Lewis's interference was not the sole explanation of the matter; that, though a very important influence, it was only one conspiring influence among several; that the Confederates had at least a plausible case against Charles; and that they might conceivably have acted as they did though Lewis had never existed. So far as they were unduly or unworthily influenced by the tempter, they had their appropriate reward; when they were once committed to the struggle with the power of Burgundy, their royal ally forsook them no less basely than their imperial lord, and the pernicious habits introduced by this first handling of French gold remained the disgrace and bane of the Swiss commonwealths till the stain was wiped out in our own day.

* The Easter Song of 1474 ran thus :

“Christ ist erstanden, der Landvogt ist gefangen ;

Des sollend wir fro syn.

Siegmond soll unser Trost syn, Kyrie eleison.

Wär er nit gefangen, so wär's übel gangen ;

Seyd er nun gefangen ist, hilft him nüt syn böse List.”

J. v. Müller, b. iv. c. vii. note 572. So Schilling of Luzern, p. 66.

Still it is not fair to look upon even these dangerous dealings with Lewis with the eyes of the nineteenth century. Every man who took the King's money was not necessarily acting corruptly. No doubt it would have been nobler to refuse to touch a sou of it in any case. The high-minded refusal of Freiburg at the time of the King's first offers reads like some of the noblest stories of the best days of old Rome. To take the money, whether for a commonwealth or for an individual, was dangerous and degrading; but it was far from being so dangerous or so degrading as the like conduct would be now. We have no right to say that either a commonwealth or an individual was bribed or bought, unless it can be shown that he or they were induced by gifts to adopt a line of conduct which their unbought judgments condemned. Diessbach may have been a traitor of this kind; Zellweger demands his condemnation as well as Mr. Kirk, and Bern and Switzerland can afford to give him up. But we must not extend the same harsh measure to every man who grasped a few gold pieces from the royal storehouse. It might be a reward; it might be a subvention; it was not necessarily a bribe, as we now count bribes. We have a feeling nowadays about taking money at all which had no sort of existence in the fifteenth century. In those days men freely took what they could get: judges took presents from suitors, and ambassadors took presents from the princes to whom they were deputed; sovereigns and their councillors became the pensioners of other sovereigns; kings on their progresses did not scruple to receive purses filled with gold as an earnest of the love of their subjects. And many of these practices long survived the days of Charles the Bold. The English patriots of the reign of Charles the Second took the money of Lewis the Fourteenth as freely as Aratos in old times took the money of King Ptolemy. But neither Aratos nor Algernon Sidney could be fairly called corrupt; the interest of the patriot was, in either case, believed to be the same as the interest of the foreign king, and the patriot did not disdain the foreign king's money as help given to the common cause. The subventions publicly granted by Lewis the Eleventh to the several Cantons were really of much the same nature as the subsidies in which England not so long ago dealt very largely. In all these cases there is much of danger and temptation in handling the seducing metal, but the mere act is not of itself necessarily corrupt. The worst to be said of the Swiss is that, in a not very scrupulous age, they did not show themselves conspicuously better than other people. The friends of France took the King's money, and the friends of Burgundy took the Duke's,—for Charles had his paid partisans also, though he was both less bountiful and less discreet in the business than his

rival. In taking foreign money, as in serving as mercenaries, the Swiss simply did like the rest of the world; only various circumstances made these bad habits more conspicuous and more permanent in them than in other nations. These transactions with Lewis were the beginning of these evil practices,—practices which seriously lowered the dignity and independence of the Swiss people down to the abolition of the military capitulations by the Constitution of 1848. An individual Swiss can now sell himself to a foreign power, just as an individual Englishman can; but no Swiss commonwealth can now, as a commonwealth, sell its citizens to the service of strangers. The origin of these degrading habits is to be traced to the war of Burgundy; but it is not fair to speak, as De Gingins and Mr. Kirk do, of the war of Burgundy itself as an instance of mercenary service. We believe that in that war the Swiss were neither strictly fighting for their hearths and homes, nor yet basely shedding their blood in an alien quarrel. They were fighting in a war of policy, a war into which they had drifted, as the phrase is, through a variety of influences, the diplomacy and the gold of Lewis being one among several.

The Swiss then acted simply like other people, neither better nor worse; only there is a sort of disposition in many people specially to blame the Swiss if they did not act better than other people. They were republicans, and ought to have set examples of all the republican virtues. But in truth the Swiss of that age were not theoretical republicans at all. They had the strongest possible attachment to the rights of their own cities and districts, but they had no notion whatever of the rights of man. They had no rhetorical horror of kings, such as appears in some measure among the old Greeks and Romans, and in a form of exaggerated caricature among the French revolutionists. In truth, they were subjects of a king; they had indeed no king but Cæsar, but Cæsar was their king, though they had contrived to cut down his royal powers to a vanishing-point. Again, people often fancy that the Swiss of that day were a mere people of shepherds and mountaineers, like the Swiss of a hundred and fifty years earlier. They expect to find in every part of the Confederation the supposed simple virtues of the inhabitants of the Forest Cantons. But the refined and skilful statesmen and diplomatists of the Bernese aristocracy were men of quite another mould. They lived in the great world of general politics, and were neither better nor worse than other people who lived in it. Their standard was doubtless always higher than that of the mere slaves of a court, but we have no right to expect from them an impossible career of heroic virtue;

it is enough if they reach the contemporary standard of fair honest men in other countries.

Mr. Kirk, as we have said, breaks off at the opening of the war. One important part of the subject is therefore almost wholly omitted, the complicated relations of the House of Savoy to Burgundy, Switzerland, and France. But we will not forestall Mr. Kirk's concluding volume; we shall look for it with anxiety; and if he will only fall back on the better manner of his earlier chapters, it will contain a narrative which no amount of disagreement can render other than pleasant and profitable to the reader.

ART. VI.—THE RACES OF THE OLD WORLD.

The Nationalities of Europe. By R. G. Latham, M.A., F.R.S. 2 vols. London, 1863.

The Races of the Old World. By Charles L. Brace. 1 vol. London, 1863.

Historico-Geographical Atlas. By Dr. Karl von Spruner. (English edition.) London, 1861.

Anthropology of Primitive Peoples. By Dr. Theodor Waitz. Vol. I. (English edition.) London, 1863.

Types of Mankind; or, Ethnological Researches, based upon the ancient Monuments, Paintings, Sculptures, and Crania of Races. By J. C. Nott, M.D., and G. R. Gliddon. London, 1854.

THE historical period of mankind does not begin even with the invention of letters and the keeping of written records. Time's effacing fingers, which have destroyed so much, have not spared the records of primeval history kept by the earliest nations of civilised mankind. Nevertheless the decay produced by time has destroyed little in comparison with other causes. Social, dynastic, and especially religious revolutions, arising in the bosom of those old civilisations, have been far more potent agents of destruction. And still more has the work of destruction been carried on by those inbursts of alien, conquering races, which have overthrown and obliterated all but one of the civilisations of the primeval world. Man himself has been the chief agent in consigning to oblivion the history and knowledge of his fellow-men. In those early times, when the wide sympathy for all things human which distinguishes the present age was unknown, and when humanity presented itself in but a narrow form, each nation cared only for itself, for its own history, religion, and civilisation, and regarded those of other

nations with contempt and destructive hatred. China, the most fortunate of all countries in this respect—the great link which unites the world of to-day with primeval times—whose civilisation alone has survived in continuity unbroken, save by its own natural stages of development, from the dawn of humanity to the present day—has not wholly escaped the destruction of records and monuments which consigned to oblivion, or to a dim twilight of doubts and speculation, the history of other primeval civilisations. The great but short-lived political revolution accomplished by Che-hoang-te, the “first great emperor,” 200 years before Christ,—the conflict between arbitrary power, on the one hand, and the constitutional principles and old form of government represented by the “men of letters,” the only aristocracy of China, on the other,—condemned to destruction the ancient records and literature, upon which these men of letters and the people at large built their political creed, and which, as the text-books of the national education, tended to keep alive the spirit of popular freedom. In Egypt, the wanton burning of the great Alexandrian library completed, by an act of religious bigotry, the destruction of the history and knowledge of a most ancient people, whose national life had previously been trodden out under the heel of four different races of conquering invaders. In the ancient civilisation also which grew up on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, historical records were kept, and knowledge of many kinds registered, in written documents, stamped upon tablets of enduring clay, and apparently also preserved on paper or sheets of parchment. But there also the destroying hand of man has been at work, obliterating the knowledge of the past,—firing temples and palaces, upon whose walls were preserved the state-history of the country, and bringing such calamities upon the land that the surpassingly fertile plain relapsed into an arid waste, and the old population disappeared utterly, leaving behind them not even a knowledge of the language they had inscribed upon the tablets and ruined monuments, which Nature happily took into her own keeping, and covered over with a grassy verdure sprung from the dust of their own decay. Of the innumerable written documents of Egypt—of which even the Alexandrian library contained but a small portion—only a few injured and half illegible papyri have been recovered, and some fragments of chronological tables have come down to us in questionable guise through the translation of post-Christian writers. Of the native records and literature of Babylonia and Assyria we know still less: the translated fragments of Berosus being nearly all that the conquering civilisation of Greece has handed down for our instruction. An-

cient Persia also—the Persia which existed before Cyrus, and abreast of the early Babylonian empire—had a literature and records; but of these nothing now remains but an ill-preserved copy of the Zendavesta.

If history could go back to the invention of written records, by which the events and thoughts of mankind were first put in an enduring form, it would indeed go very far. In the remotest times of Egypt of which we have any remains, we find that the art of writing had been invented, and that records were kept. In Babylonia we find the same, and likewise in China. But few as are the fragments of that anciently recorded knowledge which we possess, the greater part has been recovered by us, rather than preserved for us by the intermediate races of civilised mankind. Our knowledge of these early times is in truth a discovery. We have exhumed it from long-buried ruins, and have learnt for ourselves to read in the inscriptions on those ruins languages which the world had forgotten, and which have not been spoken for two or three thousand years. The new science of philology also has come to aid us in the investigation of those old times, showing us the relations of the archaic languages, and, inferentially, of the races which spoke them, with languages and nations which are fully within the ken of history. It may truly be said that the further we are receding from the remote past, the more are we becoming acquainted with it. And as yet we are merely at the beginning of this new knowledge. It cannot be doubted that we shall yet obtain more papyri from Egypt, and find more inscriptions upon its monuments; and also that further study will enable us to interpret the ancient hieroglyphic writings of that country with greater precision. In regard to the old civilisations of the valley of the Euphrates, a similar expansion of knowledge undoubtedly awaits us, not only in the exhuming of more monuments, and the exploration of more ruins, but also in the deciphering of the many clay tablets and cylinders covered with writing which are already in our possession. Of ancient India, whose civilisation was of considerably later date, we already know much; but a new expansion of our knowledge is beginning through the archaeological researches commissioned by the Indian Government, and ably conducted by General Cunningham.* Of an-

* In making this appointment, for the examination of the ancient architectural remains of Upper India, the late Viceroy said, in words worthy of the son of George Canning: "It will not be to our credit as an enlightened ruling power, if we continue to allow such fields of investigation as the remains of the old Buddhist capital in Behar, the vast ruins of Kanouj, the plains round Delhi studded with ruins more thickly than even the Campagna of Rome, and many others, to remain without more examination than they have hitherto received." Major-General Cunningham, who has for this purpose been appointed Archæo-

cient China also, whose records were kept from the earliest period of its civilisation, our knowledge will ere long become fuller and more exact ; for, in proportion as that vast country becomes opened to Europeans, we shall obtain fuller access to its old chronicles, and ampler acquaintance with its early history.

Availing ourselves of the present means of information, let us endeavour to sketch as on a map the early developments of civilisation, from the dawn or twilight of history, when they first appeared as glimmering isolated lights, down to the commingling of races and expansion of knowledge which have been gradually widening the sphere of civilisation, and slowly imparting to it that character of universality which the future doubtless will fully realise. Recent discoveries, indeed, give us glimpses of a period when, both in Europe and in America, at a most remote antiquity, there was no civilisation at all. These discoveries, as compendiously set forth in Sir C. Lyell's new book, open to us a vista through which we see the human race existing on the earth at a period more remote, and under circumstances more singular, than had hitherto ever been imagined. We find early man existing in Europe along with the mammoth, woolly elephant, the cave-lion, tiger, rhinoceros, hyena, and gigantic deer,—all of which species of animals became extinct many thousands of years ago ; and in America we find him existing along with the kindred species of gigantic animals which we imagined had disappeared from the earth long before the creation of man. It is worthy of notice, that even at that exceedingly remote time mankind seems to have exhibited almost as great structural diversities as at the present day : for if in the skull of the Neanderthal man we find a brute-like configuration not easy to parallel among the existing tribes, on the other hand the skull of the Engis man, which is of at least equal antiquity, is of ordinary development, and might have belonged to an individual of the present population of Europe. This prehistoric population seems to have lived in caves, or in rude dwellings on the banks of rivers, and at a later time in little villages built on piles, in the shallows of lakes,—obtaining the means of subsistence by fishing or hunting,—doubtless clothing themselves to some extent in the skins of the slain animals,—and making all their implements of bone or stone, the use of metals being to them an unknown art. It is certainly startling to think of mankind existing at a time when

logical Surveyor to the Government of India, is the first authority on the subject of Buddhism and the Pali inscriptions, and was a coadjutor of Wilson, Prinsep, Wilford, and other eminent scholars. His first Report, for 1861-2, has been published by the Bengal Asiatic Society.

species of the elephant and rhinoceros, of the lion, tiger, and hippopotamus shared with him the forest-clad plains and valleys of Europe, and when the British Isles were united alike with one another and with the Continent: but, save for the presence of these long-extinct animals, there is little in the condition of those prehistoric men which cannot be paralleled among the barbarous tribes still existing in various parts of the world. The rude tribe, for example, in the valley of the Somme, where so many flint implements have been found,—who appear to have lived upon the ice which in that glacial period covered the river, making holes in the icy floor through which they dropped their hooks to catch the fish in the waters beneath,—led a life in many respects similar to that of some of the Esquimaux tribes of the present day. And at the other extremity of the American continent—in Tierra del Fuego, with its densely wooded hill-sides and extensive glaciers,—there still exists a population of savages in a condition strikingly similar to that of the tribes of remotest antiquity whose remains we find in the flint tools and stone implements of the “drift.” The natives of that inhospitable region are unacquainted with the metallurgic arts, and use “stone tools, flint knives, arrow and spear heads of flint or volcanic glass, for cutting bark for canoes, flesh, blubber, and sinews,—for knocking shell-fish off the rocks, breaking large shells, killing guanacoës (in time of deep snow), and for weapons.” In every sheltered cove where wigwams are placed, there are invariably heaps of refuse—shells and stones, offal and bones—which often appear very old, being covered deeply with wind-driven sand or water-washed soil, on which there is a growth of vegetation,—an exact counterpart of the “kitchen-middens” of the so-called “stone age” in Scandinavia. These heaps are from six to ten feet high, and from ten or twenty to more than fifty yards in length: but—as in the kitchen-middens of Europe—no human bones, we are told, would be found in them (unless dogs had dragged them thither), because the natives either burn the bodies of their dead, or sink them with large stones in deep water.

Curious as are the recent discoveries which indicate the antiquity of man, the real history of our race only begins with the first dawns of civilisation amidst the primeval darkness of savage life. We may picture the earth at that time as overshadowed with vast and gloomy forests, in all parts save where tracts of barren sand still exist, and roamed over by sparse tribes of barbarous mankind, maintaining a precarious existence, and a disputed dominion with vast herds of wild or ferocious animals. At length, amidst that primeval darkness and gloom, alike of earth and man, three separate

centres of light and civilisation began to shine. One of these was in the furthest corner of eastern Asia, where the Chinese nation, entering its present territory from the north-west, began to fell the forests, drain the rich but marshy plains, and spread their dominion southwards to the Yangtse-Kiang, driving before them a barbarous race of earlier settlers, who were contented to live in the primeval forests as rude hunters, and of whom a portion survive in the scattered tribes of the Miaou-tse, occupying some of the mountain-districts of south-western China. Another of these spots of light arose in the lower part of the Euphrates valley, where the great Hamitic chief Nimrud established the first military empire of the world; and although that empire was shortlived, and a long interval ensued during which we lose sight of the beginnings of Babylonian civilisation, it appears to have continued its course, with various vicissitudes, down to the time when it emerges into historic light, about 2200 years before Christ. The third of these nearly simultaneous civilisations arose in the valley of the Nile, where Menes at length gathered all Egypt into one kingdom, and commenced a monarchy the most famous of the old world for the grandeur of its ruins.

These earliest of civilisations all arose independently of one another. There seems, indeed, to have been some slight connexion in very early times between ancient Babylonia and Egypt; but that connexion is so legendary, and the traces of community of ideas are so imperceptible, that they cannot be held to impair the independent character of either of these primeval civilisations. In regard to China, the purely native character of its civilisation, and its original independence of all foreign influences, are beyond dispute. It is to be observed, as a matter of no small ethnological significance, that none of these primeval empires was established by the two races of mankind, the Aryan and Semitic, which we now deservedly account the highest. It was the Mongolian race in China, and the Hamitic race in Babylonia and Egypt, that first blossomed into civilisation. Next appeared the Aryan family of the Persians, around Balkh and in western Afghanistan, advancing south-westwards until under Jemsheed they founded Persepolis. Simultaneously the Aryan family of the Hindoos, entering India from the north-west, and journeying slowly across the Punjab, began to settle and build cities on the upper plains of the Ganges and Jumna. But long before these twin Aryan nations had risen to greatness, the pure Semitic race had established itself in power and pomp in the valley-land of the Tigris and Euphrates. Semitic tribes appear to have formed part of the very mixed population of Babylonia in the earliest

times of which we have cognisance ; and in the sixteenth century B.C. an invasion from Arabia overthrew the native Chaldee monarchy, and established a Semitic dynasty in its stead. Meanwhile another branch of the Semites, the Aramæan, rose into greater power in Assyria, and in the thirteenth century it conquered Babylonia, extinguished the monarchy, and annexed the country to the empire of Nineveh. The Semite tribe of the Jews had previously established themselves in Palestine, on their exodus from Egypt (about 1400 B.C.); and the Phœnician people, also Semitic, were commencing that career of commerce and navigation which distinguished them from all the other races of the old world. This was the first heyday of Semitic power. The rule of the Assyrian monarchs extended eastwards over Persia, northwards to the Caspian and almost to the Black Sea, westwards to the shores of the Ægean and the Levant, and even Lower Egypt for a time owned its suzerainty. But in the sixth century before Christ the dominion of the Semitic race came suddenly to an end,—to rise again with equal suddenness, and far greater brilliance, twelve centuries afterwards, in the Arabian branch of the race.

The empire of Cyrus marks the opening of the second great epoch of human history—the true middle ages of civilised times. The primeval isolation of states and peoples thenceforth began to give way. The march of armies, in rude fashion, brought nations into contact, and widened the sphere of human knowledge. The blazing ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, moreover, while marking the downfall of Semitic power, arose like signal-fires to announce the advent of a new race upon the world's stage, whose glory was destined to eclipse that of all the other great sections of mankind. The Hamitic race had had its day. At one time occupying the south-western coasts of Asia, from Egypt to beyond the Persian Gulf, it seems every where in Asia to have given way to the Semitic race, prior to the fifteenth century before Christ, and only remained erect in the immemorial centre of its power, Egypt. But now both Hamites and Semites were to be deposed from their thrones by the earliest conquering branch of the Aryan or Indo-European race. After the sister Aryan nations of the Persians and Hindoos parted company, the Persians appear to have been engaged in constant warfare with the ruder Turanian tribes, who occupied the region where they settled, and whom they conquered and drove out. Future discoveries may possibly succeed in throwing light upon that early period in the history of the Persians ; but as yet we only know that its main features are, the religious revolution accomplished by Zoroaster (the earliest lawgiver, and the first great man who

believed that he had obtained a revelation from the Deity), the half-religious, half-political warfare with the Scythic or Turanian tribes, the founding of Persepolis, and the conquest by the Babylonians or Assyrians. As long as they remain on the plateau of Iran, the ancient Persians are invisible to us; but from the moment that they descend through the passes of the Zagros mountain-chain into the Mesopotamian valley, they usurp dominion, and concentrate upon themselves the gaze of subsequent times. Shifting the centre of their power to Babylon, while maintaining their old supremacy eastwards to the Indus, they quickly overrun Syria and Egypt, and pouring northwards through the "Syran gates," extend their dominion over all Asia Minor up to the shores of the Hellespont. The Hamitic and Semitic populations were now overlaid by an upper caste of Aryan conquerors; and a network of administration brought all south-western Asia, from the Indus to the Hellespont, and from the Caspian to the Cataracts of the Nile, into one dominion. The primitive seats of Hamitic, Semitic, and Aryan rule—Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia—became fused into one dominion, and projected their power westwards to the seas of Europe.

Hitherto the dawnings of civilisation had been confined to the countries lying on the sea-board of southern Asia, and to the adjoining valley-land of the Nile. The great mountain-girdle of Asia, which extends from the shores of the Black Sea to the eastern frontier of Nepaul, and the lateral chain which runs north-eastward from that point, forming the inland frontier of China Proper, is the line which then, as now, separated the seats of Eastern civilisation from the immense region of steppes and deserts, roamed over by barbarous tribes, which constitutes the interior and bulk of the Asiatic continent. The Chinese and Hindoos still remained in perfect isolation from one another and from the rest of the world—as the Chinese, indeed, have done almost to the present day. But the political fusion of the Hamitic, Semitic, and Aryan peoples of south-western Asia created an empire, born of military conquest, and disposed to extend its acquaintance with the surrounding nations by a military career. It occupied the whole region between the Indus and the Ægean Sea; its outposts were on the Hellespont, and it was ready to throw itself across.

Europe, indeed, had as yet nothing to tempt the cupidity of a conqueror, unless it were his mere lust of dominion. Long after a girdle of growing light had begun to fringe the Asiatic continent, from China to Egypt, Europe remained in barbaric darkness, covered with primeval forests and marshes, tenanted only by wandering tribes, who built no cities and practised little

agriculture. But almost contemporaneous with the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, and with the establishment of Assyrian supremacy (by the conquest of Babylon) over the whole of Mesopotamia, the first faint dawnings of European civilisation arose in the hilly and by no means fertile peninsula which forms the south-eastern corner of our continent, and which lies most open to the influx of settlers and ideas alike from Asia and Egypt. The Greeks had reached their early manhood when the ambition of Xerxes attempted to extend the dominion of Persia across the Hellespont; and the great feat which marked the maturity of their nation was the Eastern expedition of Alexander, which subjected to Hellenic rule the whole area of Asia and Egypt, which had formed the empire of Cyrus and his successors. The empire of Alexander is remarkable as the commencement of that triumph of Europe over Asia—of that invasion of the East by the West—which is still going on, which is extending the dominion of Russia across the interior of Asia to the shores of the Pacific, which has enthroned the British race in India, and which has led an Anglo-French army in easy triumph to the capital of China. Alexandria became the standard of Greek conquest, the seat of Hellenic learning, in Egypt; the Greek city of Seleucia on the Tigris usurped the place of Babylon; and Hellenic colonists and influence introduced a new commingling of peoples and ideas throughout south-western Asia.

The brief but brilliant and influential career of Hellenic conquest had very little immediate effect upon the development of the European continent. The Greeks, leaving barbaric Europe behind them, threw themselves into Asia; and the armies and colonies sent forth into the East, by draining away the flower of the small population of Greece, were doubtless the chief cause of the premature decay of the Hellenic race in its own country—just as the conquest and colonisation of America produced a similar effect in after times upon the fortunes of Spain. But the rise of the Roman power, which in turn succeeded to the supremacy, produced very different results. Rome never acquired the full inheritance of the empire of Cyrus and Alexander in the East. Persia, Bactria, Afghanistan, and the provinces on the Indus, formed no part of the Roman empire; even the Mesopotamian valley, though overrun at times by the Legions, was a "land debatable," which belonged as much to the rulers of Persia as to Rome. It was in Europe and in Africa that the distinguishing triumphs of Roman arms and civilisation were won. Spain, Gaul, Britain, and the valley of the Danube, were, by the arms of the Legions, brought within the sphere of civilisation, and owed to their conquerors their

first grand impulse in the career of national development. The whole northern coast of Africa, too, extending between Egypt and the Atlantic—a region unknown to the armies of Alexander or his predecessors in empire—was conquered, organised, and partially colonised by the lordly race of Rome; and relics of Roman dominion have even been found on the southern side of the great desert of Sahara. The Greeks influenced the countries which they conquered almost exclusively by their ascendancy in the arts. Their material power was very small. After the death of Alexander, his generals contented themselves with becoming heads of native states, which became their adopted country, which they ruled without any reference to Greek empire, and where the improvements which they introduced were no other than would have occurred if the natives had voluntarily chosen a Greek adventurer for their king. But with Rome the case was very different: all her conquests were incorporated with the parent state, and subjected to a wise code of laws, and an admirable administrative system, such as had never been established among the isolated little states of Greece. Besides these, Rome carried into every country the elements of material civilisation—roads, bridges, public buildings, and the useful arts of life; and in this way her conquests, which were by far the most extensive of any ancient state, proved also the most beneficial for mankind, and awoke Europe from her primeval barbarism to engage in that career of civilisation in which she has since outshone all the rest of the world.

Rome, too, had her day and fell. But she did not fall, like her predecessors in supremacy, under the attack of a more powerful or more civilised race than her own, but under the attacks of a multiplicity of nations, most of them barbarous, for the most powerful of which singly she was far more than a match, yet whose never-ending assaults at length exhausted her strength. The tribes of Goths, Vandals, and Huns, who were mainly instrumental in overthrowing the western empire of Rome, belonged to no organised community, and speedily disappeared from the scene, hardly leaving a trace of their existence. But the assailants of her eastern empire, which upheld the glory of the Latin rule for centuries after the city of Rome had become the prey of many spoilers, were of a different kind. And the foremost of these in civilisation, and also (until the rise of the Turks) in power, was the Saracenic empire founded by Mahomet—constituting a new uprising of the Semitic race, in the only quarter (Arabia) where it had preserved both its purity of blood and its national independence. The conquests of the Persians under Cyrus and his successors had been animated in

no small degree by religious fervour, by a zeal to diffuse the Zoroastrian worship—to make triumphant the cause of Ormuzd over that of Ahriman, the latter of which seemed to them represented by all nations who differed from themselves in religious belief. No such spirit inspired the conquests of the tolerant paganism of Greece and Rome; but it burst forth in greater zeal—indeed, with a fury unparalleled before or since—in the Arabian race who adopted the religion of Mahomet, and who struck the first heavy blows against the eastern empire of Rome. With a sudden flood of conquest they quickly overran Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt; twice, but unsuccessfully, they besieged Constantinople; they occupied Sicily and part of Italy; they conquered all northern Africa and Spain, and even carried their arms into France. Persia, Bactria, and Afghanistan became subject to their dominion and religion. And although they never established a stable and organised unity of empire like that of Rome, the religion and laws of the Koran became an enduring bond of union among all the populations of western Asia and northern Africa, from the banks of the Indus to the Straits of Gibraltar.

This new and brilliant outburst of Semitic power had lasted for about four centuries, when a totally different race from any which had hitherto aspired to wide dominion appeared on the scene. The Turk from the north, descending from the steppes of Upper Asia, overran Persia, Afghanistan, and Syria, and while adopting the religion, rapidly extinguished the Asiatic empire of the Arabians. The Caliphate of Spain long survived, but when it too fell the power of the Semitic race came wholly to an end, and there do not seem any elements of the race left adequate to produce another revival. The Hamitic race has disappeared, leaving only some physical traits among the feeble Copts and Fellahs of Egypt. The Semitic race, as a political power, has likewise sunk, apparently never to rise again, although the influence of the Jewish branch of the race, not collectively, but in the action of individual members, is felt in almost every court in Europe. The Turk took the place of the Arab, and established a wider and far stronger empire. Assailed by the Arab in the south, and by the Turk in the east, the states of Europe, then more isolated than the Grecian republics at the time of the Persian invasion, were roused to a common effort against the foe. Rallying at the summons of the Head of the Church, Christendom stayed its internal wars, and sent forth its chivalry to attack Mohammedanism in the centre of its power; but after a brief success the effort failed. Jerusalem was recaptured by the soldiers of the Crescent, the remnant of the Crusaders were driven out of Syria, and over-

passing the limits of Asia, the Ottoman Turks captured Constantinople, overran Greece, and solidly established the centre of their power in Europe.

The capture of Constantinople by the Turks (1453) terminates the middle ages of civilised history, as the capture of Babylon by Cyrus marked their beginning. If we omit the great work accomplished by Rome in civilising western Europe, the most remarkable feature of the two thousands years embraced in this period is the grand duel carried on between Asia and Europe. The Persian empire began the conflict by the invasion of Greece; Alexander the Great retaliated by overthrowing the empire of Persia, and establishing a Greek dominion over western Asia. To the Greek succeeded the Roman, who held western Asia in his firm grasp, from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, for eight centuries, and retained some part of his Asiatic dominion for nearly four centuries longer. Hitherto the results of this long duel had been wholly in favour of Europe. But the tide turned. The Arab established his dominion in Spain, and menaced France; the Mongols conquered Russia, and made war upon Poland; the Turk possessed himself of the south-eastern countries of Europe, up to the frontiers of Venice and the middle of Hungary, along with the Russian provinces lying around the Black Sea,—carrying his arms also into Italy, and waging war with the flower of Germany around the walls of Vienna. One-half of Europe fell under the dominion of Asia; and every people but our own, the North Germans, and the Scandinavians, were brought into mortal conflict with the alien races of the victorious East. The mighty fabric of Roman empire had fallen, and with it for several centuries disappeared the power of Europe. The conquests of Charlemagne, in the latter part of the eighth century, might have laid the foundations for a new fabric of European power; but his empire only endured for his lifetime, and Europe relapsed into its fragmentary condition, out of which in due time were to emerge the kingdoms of the present day.

The modern period of history is ushered in by the struggles of the European peoples to regain their independence, and expel the Asiatic invaders. Spain, which had earliest fallen under Asiatic dominion, was also the first country to throw off the yoke; and at the end of the fifteenth century the Moors were expelled, after having held their ground in Europe for eight hundred years. In the middle of the sixteenth century, the Russians, under Ivan the Terrible, freed themselves from the yoke of the Mongols; and in the beginning of the seventeenth century (partly owing to the formidable antagonism which arose between them and the Persians) the aggressive

attitude of the Turks in Europe was stayed; and our ambassador, Sir Thomas Roe, pronounced (1628) his memorable opinion, that "this empire may stand, but never rise again." The Austrian empire steadily increased in power, acquiring one-half of its provinces from the slowly-shrinking dominion of the Turks; and with the exception of the suppression of the kingdom of Poland, and the establishment of unity in Italy, and independence in Greece, the map of Europe presented nearly the same political divisions as at the present time. The tide of conflict between Europe and Asia was again on the turn. Turkish power in Europe began slowly to wane; and although by relaxing their rule, and suppressing many of its distinctive features, the Turks still preserve a considerable portion of their European conquests, the energies of the European nations, flowing round the flanks of their empire, have in recent times subjected a large portion of Asia to their sway. The British have established themselves as the ruling race in India; the Russians are spreading through central Asia and across Siberia to the mouth of the Amoor; and England and Russia, from opposite quarters, have annihilated the primeval seclusion of China, and will ere long effect an immense revolution in the condition of that oldest of empires. Indeed, had not the discovery and colonisation of the New World drawn a large and the most enterprising portion of the European nations across the Atlantic, there is reason to believe that by this time the Europeans would have installed themselves by conquest as the ruling race in every part of the Asiatic continent.

It would be a mistake to regard the triumph of one nation over another as a proof that the victors were essentially a more powerful people than the vanquished. At the moment of conflict they must indeed have been so; but their superiority may have arisen from a decline on the part of the conquered nation from its former greatness. And in no case is success in arms an absolute test of superiority in civilisation. The conquests of the Mongols over the Chinese empire in the East, over Russia in the West, and over the southern states of Asia, were the triumphs of barbarous hordes, under the leadership of great military chiefs, over nations infinitely their superiors in civilisation. The qualities which confer empire upon a people are, firstly, their military power; and secondly, their capacity for administrative organisation, which, by conciliating and turning to account the resources of the conquered nations, augments the power of the empire state, and gives permanence to its sovereignty. The Egyptians and Babylonians were less martial peoples than the Assyrians, although seemingly their superiors in point of material civilisation; the Persians in turn were

better soldiers than the Assyrians, and the Greeks were superior to their predecessors in dominion alike in arts and in arms. But the great empire of Rome fell before powers and peoples not one of which would have been a match for her in the zenith of her strength, and which ultimately triumphed over her only because of the exhaustion produced by the aggregate of their ceaseless attacks. Rome, in the years of her decline, had three continents to contend against; and if her eastern empire, divorced from the West,—the mere head, without either the heart or body, of the old Roman empire,—was able to cope with the Saracenic power when at its zenith, and so long make head against the still more formidable Ottomans, we may doubt whether the attacks of either of these powers would not have rattled harmlessly off the armour of old Rome in the time of Trajan or Aurelian.

In the events of the long period of history, extending over more than four thousand years, which we have thus briefly sketched all the leading races of the Old World took part. Now let us, as briefly, look at the ethnology of the subject, and see what the latest science can tell us of the origin and mutual relations of those various, and some of them almost vanished, races. Classification is indispensable to science, and is of great use also to the general reader, even though it be, as in most cases it is, founded on an imperfect generalisation. In regard to the races of mankind, the classifications or generalisations of science are very imperfect. Indeed, ethnologists themselves are so much at variance on this subject, that almost every independent inquirer is disposed to propound a classification of his own. Mr. Charles Brace, in his excellent manual of ethnology, adopting the classification to which there are the fewest objections, divides the races of the Old World into three prominent families of nations,—the Turanian, the Semitic, and the Aryan,—besides a fourth of comparatively little importance, the Hamitic. We doubt whether the title Aryan, now coming into vogue as a cognomen for the Indo-European family of nations, is a good one. *Arya* is not, as Mr Brace supposes, “the most ancient name which the ancestors of this family gave themselves.” It was the title adopted by the ancestors of the sister nations of Persians and Hindoos; but we have no knowledge, and no reason for believing, that it was employed by the ancestors of the Celts, Teutons, Greeks, Romans, and other European races, who constitute by far the larger section of the family. On this account, we prefer the term Indo-European as the generic title of this great family of nations, reserving the term Aryan as the fitting cognomen of the eastern or Asiatic branch of the family, represented by the

Persians and Brahmanical Hindoos. The Semitic race gives rise to little controversy. And obviously for this reason, that it was a compact family, occupying a distinct geographical area, each branch of the family being in juxtaposition with the others, and exhibiting an almost perfect resemblance in spirit, language, and physical appearance. The two leading branches of the Semitic stock were the Aramæans, who founded the Assyrian monarchy, and the Arabians, who established the empire of the Caliphs; and two minor branches were the Jews and Phœnicians. The Hamitic peoples appear to have been a scattered vanguard of the Semitic race, which, losing connexion with the original stock, pushed on to the coasts of south-western Asia, and, probably mingling with other populations, erected states in Babylonia and in Egypt before the lagging main-body of their family (the pure Semites) had attained to a distinctive national existence. Bunsen, indeed, regards the Hamitic peoples as an offshoot from the central mass of mankind before there had been any emigration of the Semitic and Aryan races, and while as yet the distinction between Aryan and Semite had not arisen. We are disposed to regard this view as the most correct; nevertheless, as the Hamitic line of migration was the same as that subsequently taken by the Semitic race, any one who chooses to regard the Hamites as the lost vanguard of the succeeding wave of population, or, in the words of Mr Brace, as "the earliest appearance of crystallisation of the Semitic race," will be pretty near the truth. Mr Rawlinson, in common with other authorities, holds that the Hamitic people, who founded the Babylonian state, came from Egypt—Egypt being, in the opinion of these authorities, the sole original seat of the Hamites. We must dissent from this opinion; indeed, we regard it as discordant with the established facts in regard to the early migrations of mankind. Since the Hamite population existed in Egypt, it evidently must first have passed through Mesopotamia, Syria, and Arabia; hence, even on *à priori* considerations, we should expect to find a Hamitic population occupying some parts of those countries until driven out by the succeeding wave of Semitic population. And, so far as the twilight of history permits us to see, this is just what we do find. A few years ago, in spite of the frequent allusion in the classic writers to Ethiopians of Asia, it was not believed that a Hamitic population existed in Babylonia, or in any other part of the Asiatic continent. Mr Rawlinson, convinced by the discoveries recently made in Babylonia, acknowledges that a Hamitic people not only existed, but were the original founders of civilisation, on the shores of the Persian Gulf. But he considers that these Hamites came from Egypt; whereas we enter-

tain no doubt that they were as much *in situ* in Babylonia as on the banks of the Nile. What appears to have misled Mr. Rawlinson is perhaps, firstly, the old opinion against the existence of Ethiopians in Asia; and secondly, the fact that ancient Babylonia appears to have derived the greater part of its civilisation from some persons who arrived there by sea. Probably enough, the strangers who thus arrived came from Egypt; but if the legend is to be followed at all, it shows that Babylonia was already peopled when these strangers arrived, and that they were not a colony, but simply a few individuals, superior in civilisation to the original Babylonians, and who became their instructors in religion and the arts.

The Mongolian race likewise gives rise to few points of discussion. Although, owing to its continuous existence and civilisation, far more numerous than the Semites either were or are, the Mongolian race occupies a tolerably distinct geographical area, and its various branches present an almost perfect racial resemblance to one another. Almost the whole of this numerous race is comprised in the immense population of China and Japan, the remainder of the race being nomadic tribes occupying the eastern half of interior Asia. But Mr. Brace and some other authorities, doubtless for the sake of making as few divisions as possible, couple with the pure Mongolian race certain other nations or peoples, classing them all under the term Turanian. Foremost among these peoples thus classed with the Mongolians are the Turks, and if the Turanian family were held to stop here, there would be little to object to it. The Turks who have established a settled empire in the West, and the Chinese who have done the same in the remote East, might be regarded as the opposite poles of the Turanian race, while the barbarous tribes who lie between would represent the undeveloped and commingling portions of the same stock. But under the generic title of Turanian are classed many other tribes and peoples which cannot be coupled with the Turks and Mongolians without destroying all character of unity in the so-called race. For example, not only is the pre-Aryan population of India classed as along with the Chinese Turanian, but also the population of the peninsula of Siam, and of the islands of the Pacific, as well as the Huns, Magyars, and other Asiatic peoples who forced their way into Europe. The term Turanian, in fact, can be adopted simply as a means of grouping under one head all the peoples of the Old World who do not belong to the Aryan, Semitic, or Hamitic families. In this respect it is useful; although it is a great defect that so numerous and important a race as the Mongolian (which constitutes nearly one-half of the population of the Old World) should

thus be deprived of a separate classification, and be registered as part of a family which derives its name from its insignificance—Turanians meaning “outsiders,” “people of another country,” and corresponding with the epithet “barbarians” as used by the Greeks and Romans.

The Indo-European family of nations, although far more widely dispersed than any of the other sections of mankind, presents little difficulty to the ethnographer who forms his conclusions from philology. All the nations which compose it are now highly civilised; and in the Old World at least each of them exhibits a distinct unity. The family extends from India through Persia into Europe; and prior to the dislocation produced by the irruption of the Turks southward into Asia Minor and Turkey, it formed a zone of population separating the Mongolian race in the north from the Semitic and Hamitic races to the south. In the earliest times of which we have cognisance, the greater part of Asia Minor, if not the whole of it, had an Aryan or Indo-European population, of which the Pelasgic and Hellenic tribes were an offshoot. None of the other families of mankind present such wide diversities as the Indo-Europeans; and this despite of the fact that they are all civilised, and do not present the antagonisms arising from settled and savage life. All the existing religions of the world—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Christianity (the Confucianism of China, be it noted, is not a religion)—are, or have been, represented by one or other of its nations. And in language the diversity is equally remarkable. The Indo-European race is in the Old World not so numerous as the Mongolian,—the latter, exclusive of the Turkish nations, being upwards of 400,000,000 in number, and the former about 350,000,000.* But whereas the Mongolians (with the exception of the barbarous tribes) have massed themselves together in one great civilised state, the picture of unity, the Indo-Europeans are scattered over the earth, in comparatively small communities, each with a distinct language, government, and sometimes a religion and entire civilisation, of its own.

Europe, unquestionably, of all the continents is the one whose physical configuration and climatic conditions most tend to produce activity and variety in its population. Far inferior to Asia in extent, and traversed by no such immense and impassable mountain chains, Europe has no room for nations to grow up utterly apart from one another, as the Chinese and Hindoos have done in the East. It cannot exhibit such strong contrasts as we find in Asia; but it presents far more of them in

* The Semitic race probably never numbered more than 20,000,000, and the Hamitic about half that number.

proportion to its size and population. The immense region of monotonous plains and steppes which extends across Asia, from the Ural Mountains to the North Pacific, and which, with its intersecting mountain chains, constitutes the whole interior of the continent, projects also into Europe, forming a triangular space extending from the Black and White Seas up into the centre of Europe at Berlin. But this region of monotony, which is seen to be overpowering in Asia, in Europe only serves to balance, and harmoniously supplement, the more extensive maritime region, which is marked by infinite variety. With the exception of the great Sarmatian plain and the eastern steppes of Russia, Europe is broken up into a number of small countries, each the seat of a separate state. Its mountain chains, at the same time, while sufficiently grand to form natural boundaries to most of the states, are none of them so lofty as to be impassable, and present no serious obstruction to the intercommunication of the nations. The nations of Europe accordingly have grown up side by side, in long-continued conflict of arms and interchange of ideas, each benefiting by the discoveries and profiting by the experience of the others: the result being a ceaseless process of interaction and improvement, while each of the states preserves its own individuality. Nor must we overlook the influence exerted upon the ideas and habits of the population by the peculiar bay-indented configuration of Europe—a hymen of land and sea,—presenting every where to the peoples the grand spectacle and mystery of the ocean, and inciting them to enter upon a double career. No spot in Europe west of Moscow is more than five hundred miles distant from the sea; while the heart of Asia is four times as distant from the surrounding seas, and an enormous belt of mountains separates the maritime countries from the interior. The mere spectacle of the ocean acts on man like the presence of a new world,—it gives rise to new thoughts, new feelings, new aspirations; while it opens to mankind a new career, an additional sphere of activity, another means of exploration and intercommunication. These advantages have been possessed by the nations of Europe to a much greater extent than by the population of any other quarter of the globe. Nearly all Europe, too, has a temperate climate, and is reached by the sea-winds, carrying a sufficiency of moisture to all parts of the continent; whereas the freshening and fertilising air-currents from the sea reach only a comparatively small portion of Asia, and large areas of that continent, like the desert of Colis, are so shut in from the rain-bearing winds by high mountain chains, that they are condemned to perpetual aridity and sterility. It is also to be observed that the zone of moderate temperature (*i. e.*

of from 40 to 50 degrees of mean annual temperature), is a very broad one in western Europe, extending from Drontheim in Norway to the south of Spain and Italy, whereas it contracts to only a fourth of that breadth as it passes through the centre of Asia. Indeed, even when the average temperature of a district of Asia indicates a moderate climate (as in North China), the actual climate is different, being very hot in summer and very cold in winter; whereas Europe, owing to the intermingling of land and sea, has an insular climate, with a comparatively steady temperature throughout the year—a mild winter and a cool summer. In this respect also the race which has peopled Europe has had a great advantage over the other races, or branches of its own stock, which settled in Asia, and which became subjected to a climate which is either tropical (as in India and southern China) or characterised by injurious extremes.

The origin of the various peoples of Europe has been discussed by many writers, and very elaborately by Dr. Latham in his recent work on the subject. But a large portion of the field of inquiry is still involved in obscurity. We know that the Celtic, Teutonic, and Slavonic nationalities, who now constitute nearly the whole population of Europe, were not the first occupants of our continent. We know that they were preceded by an earlier wave, or more probably by several waves of population, which ethnologists term Finnic and Iberian—some authorities regarding these as belonging to one stock, others to two different families of mankind. We are disposed to regard the Fins and Iberians as distinct races; and it is not improbable also that other nationalities, contemporaneous with these, disappeared altogether under the irruption of the Celts, Teutons, and Slavonians. Anyhow, it is proved that these latter races were preceded by another population, and it is reasonable to suppose that that earlier population was not the same as that which occupied our continent in the extremely remote period to which belong the human remains found in "the drift."

At the time when the light of history begins to dawn on central and western Europe, we find the Celtic peoples located in the most westerly region of the continent—in the British Isles, Belgium, and France, in northern Italy, and partly in Spain, in which latter country they intermingled with the Iberians. We know also that the Slavonians in early times extended much further to the west than they do now—occupying, in fact, the greater part of what is now the German Fatherland. Judging by the names of places, and some other indirect means of proof, the Slavonians at one time occupied central Europe as far westward as the longitude of Hamburg,

and did not then spread as far to the north-east as they do now. But it is in regard to the Teutonic tribes that the greatest difficulty arises. We think it is doubtful whether the Teutons originally existed at all as an intermediate population between the Slavonians and Celts. There was little room for them to do so; and moreover we know that so late as the fourth century after Christ, the Goths, Longobards, and some other Teutonic peoples, were still advancing westwards through eastern Europe. There is therefore some ground for believing that the Teutonic peoples did not arrive in Europe until after the Slavonians were settled there: and that they clove their way through the sparse Slavonic population, or probably simply passed over it, to the region lying between the Upper Danube and Jutland, crossing over also into the southern half of the Scandinavian peninsula. The Slavonians, when driven eastward by the gradual encroachments of the Teutons, encroached in turn upon Finnish and semi-Asiatic tribes then occupying a large area of north-eastern Russia, and who have left traces of their blood in the present population of part of that region.

Within the historic period the Teutons have certainly been the most aggressive and successful of the three leading races of Europe. Dr. Latham observes, that the Slavonians in early times were a highly aggressive and enterprising race. Unquestionably the bold and successful Vandals were Slavonians, and probably Slavonian tribes formed part of many of the hordes who assailed the western Roman empire. Nevertheless, in the main, the Slavonians have shown themselves a peaceful race, inclined to agricultural pursuits, and more remarkable for the tenacity with which they hold their ground, even when submerged by the waves of conquest, than a spirit of enterprise and aggression. Mr. Brace eulogises them as the only European race among whom slavery was unknown: but the truth is, in ancient times the settled Slavonians appear always as a conquered, not as a conquering race, and therefore had little opportunity for enslaving others. Of the restlessness, enterprise, and military spirit of the Celts in early times we have abundant evidence. In the fourth century before Christ (390 B.C.) they invaded southern Italy, and sacked Rome; in the following century (279 B.C.) they made an irruption into Greece, and plundered Delphi; thereafter crossing into Asia Minor, where they settled under the name of Galatians. But after the subjugation of Gaul by Cæsar, we never hear of the race save as standing on the defensive; indeed, we almost lose sight of it for centuries, under the successive supremacy of the Romans and the Teutonic tribes; until, under the foreign dynasty of Charlemagne, France began to be a kingdom and the French

a nation. The Teutons first appear in history about a century before Christ (102 B.C.), in their formidable irruption into the Roman empire, which was at length repulsed by Marius. At the same time they took possession of Belgium, and began to press upon the Gauls in the valley of the Rhine; and in the succeeding centuries, although opposed by the whole power of the Roman empire, they appeared as conquerors alike in Greece and Italy, and founded kingdoms alike in Spain and France. In the east they crossed the Black Sea and made descents upon Asia Minor; in the west they invaded and became the dominant power in England. They became the ruling race in France, where they established kingdoms, and left a Teutonic dynasty and nobility which endured till the close of last century. The worst blows they ever received were from a monarch of their own race, Charlemagne, who found in the Saxons his most obstinate and redoubtable antagonists. Slowly also, partly by arms and partly by colonisation, they gained ground upon the Slavonians, driving them eastward; and the various districts of Germany which still bear the name of Mark (*i.e.* march or borderland) show the successive stages of their advance to the eastern limits of their present territory. Even in the nineteenth century we see this process of Teutonic encroachment and absorption going on. One-half of the population of the originally Slavonian province of Posen is now Teutonic; and in Hungary, Transylvania, and the valley of the Lower Danube is sprinkled a German population which is steadily gaining ground.

In many cases it is difficult to determine the nationality of the rude hordes of central Europe mentioned by the classic writers. Frequently these invading hordes were composed, not of one, but of several nationalities. The Cymbri, who must have been in the main a Celtic people, are found coöperating with the Teutons; and, in the armies of Attila, Teutons and Vandals are found in alliance with Huns and Alans and other Asiatic peoples. In some cases, different nationalities acted together voluntarily, impelled by a common necessity, or animated by a similar spirit of adventure and thirst for plunder. At other times the rise of a great leader attracted other peoples to join his standard; or a warlike nation, after vanquishing the population which lay in its path, drew them after it in its career of conquest. From the latter half of the fourth century after Christ, which witnessed the irruption of the savage Huns into Europe, until the closing years of the ninth century, which beheld a similar irruption of the Hungarians, central Europe presents a picture of almost inextricable confusion. The valley of the Danube was the great natural highway which the intruding peoples followed in their advance. The Goths—who are said

to have emigrated from Scandinavia, and who, passing through Western Russia, settled in the Ukraine, and on the northern shores of the Black Sea—formed the first flood of invasion, which, after the Christian era, poured up the Danubian valley. But it was the arrival of the Huns, more than a century afterwards (376 A.D.), which commenced the period of general commotion and confusion. Having conquered the Alans, then settled on the plains to the west of the Caspian, between the Volga and the Caucasus, and incorporating them with their host, the Huns burst upon the kingdom of the Goths, conquering one portion of them, and driving another portion across the Danube, to find refuge within the Roman dominions. Seventy years afterwards, under Attila, the power of the Huns attained a memorable expansion, and the terror of their arms was spread all over Europe, from the Euxine to the Bay of Biscay. It is this period which is represented in the first plate of Dr. Karl von Spruner's *Historico-Geographical Atlas*, and in it we see one nationality heaped upon another, or scattered into many parts, in extraordinary confusion. The kingdom of Attila extends from the Euxine to the Rhine; and within it, the Gothic tribes spread over southern Russia, from the Oder to the Crimea, with another portion occupying the southern bank of the Danube, from Buda to the sea. Between those branches of the Gothic race—in Upper Hungary and Transylvania—lie the *Lepidæ*, destined to disappear in another century, under the attacks of the Longobards and Avars. In Gallicia lie the Longobards and a portion of the Heruli; and the Wends and Vandals are in modern Prussia. The Saxons, Franks, Thuringians, Alemanni, and Burgundians form a wedge of Teutonic population, extending from Jutland to Marseilles. Italy, ruled by Odoacer and his barbarian army, will, in a few years' time, come under the dominion of Theodoric and his Ostrogoths; Spain and southern France are already under the kings of the Visigoths; and northern Africa is in the possession of Genseric and the Vandals. Meanwhile, approaching, or settled near the eastern frontiers of Europe, are seen the Avars, Bulgarians, Hungarians, and Magyars, who in due time will cause fresh commotion, and add new elements of confusion, to the population of our continent. Of these, the Avars, fleeing before the rising power of the Turks in central Asia, first entered Europe (A.D. 560), subjecting the Bulgarians in their way, and passing up the Danubian valley, established the centre of their power in Hungary. A century afterwards (A.D. 670), the Bulgarians, followed by several Slavonic tribes, Servians, Bosnians, and Croatsians, crossed the Danube, and founded their kingdom between that river and the Balkhan. Two centuries more

elapsed before the Hungarians made their terrible irruption (A.D. 890), pouring up the valley of the Danube, invading France and Italy, overthrowing the Bulgarians, and carrying their arms up to the gates of Constantinople. The Mongols came next; and while one grandson of the great Zingis (Kublai) completed the conquest of China and threatened Japan, and another (Holagon) overran Persia, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor, a third (Batou) invaded Europe (A.D. 1235), conquered Russia, penetrated through Poland into Silesia, and thereafter devastated Hungary and all the countries in the valley of the Danube. Although the dynasty of Zingis Khan was Mongolian, the greater part of the immense armies who followed his standard consisted of Turkish and other tribes; and no sooner did the empire of the Monguls decline than the Ottoman Turks began to rise to power. They first entered Europe in the middle of the fourteenth century, as allies of the Greek Emperor, and transported in his ships; in a few years afterwards Adrianople became the seat of their government; and at length, in 1453, the capture of Constantinople consolidated the empire of the Turks, and introduced one alien element more into the population of Europe.

These successive irruptions and comminglings of peoples constitute a sore puzzle for ethnologists. They affected the population of every country in Europe, and in many cases must have left substantial consequences of their operation. The Teutonic race in Germany and Scandinavia has doubtless preserved its purity better than any other. The Celtic population of France has been largely intermingled with Teutonic blood,—first, by the establishment of the Visigothic kingdom in southern France, and still more by the subsequent irruption of the Frankish tribes, who became the ruling power and upper class in the whole country. The great Slavonian race appears to have been similarly affected by the intrusion of foreign elements, and the only representatives which it has in the courts of Europe are the Princes of Servia and the Grand-duke of Mecklenburg. Rurik and his companions, who laid the foundations of the Russian empire, and who, as dukes, grand-dukes, and territorial magnates, became the ruling class of the country, are said to have been Norman Teutons, who came from Sweden. Dr. Latham, indeed, suggests that Rurik may not have come from Sweden, and also that, as the eastern part of Sweden may have been originally inhabited by Slavonians, Rurik may not have been of Teutonic extraction, but a kinsman of the race over which he and his companions established their rule. This, however is a mere conjecture, which Dr. Latham does not offer to support by any evidence.

And if it be true that the Goths who established themselves in south-eastern Russia soon after the Christian era came from Scandinavia, the minor migration of Rurik and his companions may easily be credited. But did the Goths come from the Scandinavian peninsula? That Teutonic tribes inhabited Scandinavia (in juxtaposition to ruder Finnic tribes) at the earliest epoch of which we have any record, is indisputable; but it may be questioned whether the Goths in south-eastern Russia were an offshoot of that stock. Dr. Latham is disposed to derive the name *Russi* from the Roxolani, a people mentioned by Strabo, Pliny, and Tacitus as inhabiting a district adjoining the banks of the Volga; and it is possible that these Roxolans were Teutons, and that the Goths who established the kingdom of Hermanric in the Ukraine and adjoining provinces were their descendants. In this case we should regard the Scandinavian Goths as an offshoot from this stock, instead of the Goths of Hermanric being an offshoot from Scandinavia. If this hypothesis can be established, it will render more simple and intelligible the early movements of Teutonic population. We can easily conceive the Gothic tribes passing from the Ukraine, over the low-lying plains to the north of the Carpathians, to the shores of the Baltic, and settling in Jutland, the Scandinavian peninsula, and northern Germany, where we find them at the opening of the historic period. We observe too, in corroboration of this hypothesis, that Dr. Spruner, in his Atlas, represents Kiev as "Asgard," the original seat of Odin and his comrades, the leaders of the Teutonic migration into Scandinavia. We cannot attach much importance to Dr. Latham's conjecture that the name *Russi* was a later form of the name *Roxolani*. Luitprand, in the ninth century, states that the Greeks called these men from the north *Russi* from their physical appearance—a more probable derivation; and it is also probable that the name was not a native one, but adopted by the people in consequence of their being so called by other nations. The Swedes are still called *Russ* by the Esthonians; and Dr. Latham points out that the *Russian* names of the cataracts of the Dnieper, preserved by a Byzantine writer, are unquestionably German, and especially Swedish. As the same Byzantine writer also gives the names of the same places in Slavonian, it is obvious that two distinct nationalities were then settled in south-eastern Russia. The valley of the Dniester was so German that it was called *Vallio Grutingorum*. On the whole, there is good reason to believe that the Teutonic settlement, which developed itself into the empire of Hermanric, preceded the Slavonian settlements in south-eastern Russia. King Hermanric was killed by a chief

of the old Roxolani, and it is not improbable that the Goths and Roxolans were not only neighbours, but also of the same race. If the preceding conjectures as to the original seat of the Gothic tribes can be established, we repeat, it will clear up a very vague chapter of early history; and it will also tend to show that the Teutonic tribes made their way through central Europe over a previously settled Slavonian population, whom they by and by drove eastward, and who ultimately supplanted them (obliterating almost all traces of their existence) in their original settlements in south-eastern Russia. But whatever views be held on these points, it is at least indisputable that the *Russi* of Byzantine writers were descendants of the Goths of Hermanric, who submitted to the Huns rather than leave their native seats; and the existence of this Teutonic element can hardly be unconnected with the establishment of Rurik as ruler of the Slavonians at Novogorod. "When Moscow was an Ugrian village," says Dr. Latham, "Kiev and Novogorod were famous cities;" and both at Kiev and Novogorod the ruling class was then *Russ*—i. e. Teutonic, not Slavonian.*

The Slavonians are manifestly late-comers in eastern and northern Russia. In the fourth century the Finnic or Ugrian population appears to have occupied the northern half of the present territory of Russia, as far south as Smolensko and the river Dwina; a Tartar population occupied the plains of the Lower Volga, between the Ural mountains and the Caspian; and in the south-east the Goths held the Ukraine and the region between the Lower Dnieper and the Don. On this account, and owing also to the subsequent irruptions of Asiatic tribes into eastern Russia, it appears to us almost indisputable that the Slavonian race will now be found in greatest purity in what is the central portion of its present dominions—equidistant from the intermingling wave of German aggression on the west, and from the alien nationalities which the Slavonians absorbed on the east. This brings us to Lithuania; and on the Slavonians of this province Dr. Latham makes some curious and interesting remarks. He says:

"With the single exception of the Esthonians,† the Lithuanians are

* Although Dr. Latham does not give his views on this portion of history in a settled form, we consider the suggestions which he makes and the difficulties which he starts very valuable. The view which we offer in the preceding paragraph is entirely deduced from a consideration of his suggestions: except the hypothesis that the quasi-original seat of the Goths was in south-eastern Russia rather than in Scandinavia,—an hypothesis which does not seem to have occurred to him.

† Of the Esthonians Dr. Latham says: "The purity of the Esthonian's blood is an inference from the general history of the country; though upon this point we argue rather from our ignorance than from our knowledge. He seems to be aboriginal to the soil. In other words, we know of no population that has

the most pagan of all the nations of civilised Europe : in other words, their superstitions are not only the most numerous, but they are the most redolent of heathendom. Of the thousand and one songs which illustrate the simple modes of thought of the flax-dressers and foresters of their rude regions, scarcely one is founded upon either a saintly legend or a Christian sentiment. The Virgin is nowhere ; the miracle is nowhere ; the saint nowhere. There are holy wells and mysterious groves ; but the tales connected with them are not of a holy character. There is superstition, and there is religion ; but it is the superstition which in Italy would invoke Neptune in a storm, and the religion which sees in the Sun and the Morning Star a God of Light and a Messenger of the Dawn, rather than mere heavenly bodies.

As little do the ballads savour of heroes, warriors, and robbers. For all that they tell us, there is no heroic, no predatory age in Lithuania. Of border-feuds, and of bold moss-troopers, there is scarcely a word ; and scarcely a word about any ancient king or captain. Of the songs that show even the soldier sentiment, there are but few, and the antiquity of these is but low : they date back to the times of Frederick the Great, or of Charles XII. at most. In this the Lithuanian songs stand in strong contrast to those of the Servians, the Spaniards, the Scotch, and the Germans ; in all of which the personal element and the adventure are prominent. But of the simple sentiment of rural life they are full, and the imagery corresponds. Here and there, too, there is an approach to the apologue.

The generality of the poems is of the same sort as those of Esthonia ; and, to some extent (allowing for a difference of imagery), of the Swiss and Tyrolese. But it is with those of Esthonia that the imagery most agrees. The horse, which is always called by its poetic name, *zirgus*, rather than by its ordinary name, *arklys*, appears in almost all of them. It carries the lover to his sweetheart, who is in a garden of rue and peonies, plucking lilies and preparing wreaths ; or she is helping at the mowing ; or pulling at the flax ; or, it may be, spinning in her mother's hut. The love-making, though an air of simple sentiment is flung around it, is of an ordinary kind, with a *modicum* of reserve, and but little refinement ; allowing, however, for the practice of what the Germans call 'love between the blankets,' to which the Welsh give a grosser name, and it is innocent withal. It is done prettily, to say the least—perhaps poetically."

That there are no heroic traditions among the Lithuanians is perhaps owing to the circumstance that none of their songs are older than the sixteenth century. In earlier times they fought well, though on the whole unsuccessfully, both against the Germans and the Poles. Yet their wars appear to have been mainly defensive ; and in common with the Slavonian

any pretension to having settled on it before him ; and we know of no land, beyond the limits of Esthonia, from which he has ever been derived. . . . He seems to be what we may call *in situ*. . . . The stock seems indigenous. Grafts there are few or none" (vol. i. p. 131).

race generally, they do not appear to have been much animated by the spirit of warlike aggression. It is true that the Russians, under the leadership of their Czars and nobles, have extended their dominion greatly by military conquest; but it is equally true that the Russian people, though capable of making great sacrifices in defence of their country, are averse to military life; and the conscripts show greater reluctance to leave their homes than is the case with any other people in Europe. Their native form of organisation appears to be their peculiar system of village communities, the people not being spread over the soil as cottars, but living in villages, from whence they go forth to till the adjoining lands, to which all have an equal right, and which are periodically redistributed among the villagers according to their requirements—heads of families obtaining a larger portion of land than single men. This village system, although greatly broken down after the nobility acquired their despotic powers, appears to be the native form of Slavonian organisation: it presents a striking parallel to the similar system which prevails in many parts of India. It is a curious fact also, in connexion with this parallel between Slavonian and Indian society, that the language of the Lithuanians (whom we are disposed to regard as the purest type of Slavonians) has recently been found to bear a closer resemblance than any other European tongue to the Sanskrit, the ancient literary language of India. This fact is now universally admitted by philologists. Dr. Latham adds that the Lithuanian language "is more ancient than modern: at any rate, it is more like the Latin than the Italian, more like the Greek than the Romaic, in its development."

The Teutons, including both Germans and Scandinavians, are unquestionably the predominant race in Europe. They have received no dynasties or ruling class, but have supplied these abundantly to the other races. They gave an upper class (with the "blue blood" of the Goths) to Spain, still more to the Celts of France (besides almost wholly supplanting the same race in England and Scotland), and also to the Slavonians of Russia. The Slavonians, although the most numerous race in Europe, have the most readily accepted or submitted to the intrusion and leadership of foreigners. In Russia, we have seen, the ancestors of the territorial nobility were Goths or Northmen; in Turkey, the Slavonians have been long ruled by the Ottomans; in Hungary, by the Magyars. But what of the Slavonians of Poland? We believe the case has been the same with them. Although, by so saying, we run counter to the received opinion, and advance an hypothesis of which Dr. Latham in his elaborate work does not even make mention,

we are strongly impressed with the conviction that the upper class in Poland are not of Slavonic extraction. In the first place, making every allowance for the effect of the very different form of government which has prevailed in the two nations, we cannot regard this influence as adequate to account for the remarkable diversity of national character between the Poles and Russians. In truth, if once a *prima facie* case be established for regarding the true Poles as a distinct people from the Russians, it is obvious that this difference of political institutions which has prevailed from the beginning of their history will of itself constitute a strong argument in support of our views. We do not doubt that the substratum of Polish society, constituting a majority of the population, has been from the first Slavonian; but to what is called the "class of nobles" we are disposed to attribute a different origin. This class are not nobles in our sense of the word: they are nobles rather in the sense which the Aryans gave to the term—*i. e.* "noble" in contrast to the peoples with whom they came in contact, and over whom they ruled as an upper caste. The so-called class of nobles in Poland until lately (for the barrier of exclusion was partly thrown down in the last days of the monarchy) comprised not only the magnates and all the land-owners, but also all the freemen—each of whom possessed an equality of power in political matters with the greatest magnate; and every member of the class traced his descent from Lekh and his companions, who at a remote period—probably about the fifth century—founded the Polish kingdom. "Poles," indeed, is not the native name of the people, it simply means "the people of the Plain;" and their own name for themselves was Lekhi.

The traditions regarding Lekh and his followers, and the earliest times of the monarchy, doubtless contain much that is mythical; but even the mythical portion seems to furnish some corroboration of our views. For example, one of the earliest kings, Cracus, who founded or gave his name to Cracow, is said to have had a beautiful daughter, Wenda (obviously the Wends, or western Slavonians), whom a German prince tried to obtain possession of by conquest; he was foiled in the attempt; but Wenda ultimately, after making a sacrifice, threw herself into the Vistula. Does it not seem probable that in this myth we have the Wends of the Vistula represented as the adopted children of the royal race of Lekh, who defend them successfully against their aggressive neighbours the Germans; and that the death of Wenda typifies the ultimate and voluntary extinction of the Wendic nationality, as it became merged in that of the ruling race? This is all the more probable, see-

ing that this Cracus, who became king, was the leader of a popular rebellion against the tyranny of one of the immediate descendants of Lekh, and as such doubtless in greater sympathy with the subject Wend population. The condition of the country at the present day shows that the population originally consisted of two different peoples, between whom there was an impassable barrier. There is the *Sliachta*, or caste of nobles (the descendants of Lekh), on the one hand, and the serfs or peasantry, who constitute the bulk of the population, on the other. It seems strange to us to hear of a Polish noble possessing thirty or forty villages; we understand no such rights of property or tenure: nevertheless this mode of tenure is common, if not universal, in cases where foreign settlers have established themselves over a subject population. The possession of so many villages by a Polish noble means that these village-communities are compelled to pay a certain revenue to him as their lord-paramount. In process of time, as the descendants of Lekh multiplied and the power of the nobles increased, the right to receive revenue from the inhabitants of a district was converted into a claim of actual ownership of the district, and ultimately of the villages also, who were reduced to the condition of serfs. At first, as might be expected, the *Sliachta*, or caste of nobles, paid considerable respect to the rights of the original population; and the Polish kings wisely (and doubtless with a view to preserve a counter-power to that of the nobles) regarded themselves as the representative rulers of both classes in the nation, and upheld the rights of the subject classes against the encroachments of the *Sliachta*. But when, on the lapse of the Jagellon dynasty, the sovereignty became elective, the dominant caste of the *Sliachta*, who of course monopolised the right of election, availed themselves of their new power to obtain the consent of the kings to the abrogation of the legal guarantees which protected the lower classes against the tyranny of the nobles. In 1545 King Sigismund was compelled to promise that he would not issue any *lettres de garde* against members of the *Sliachta*; and in less than a century afterwards the Statute of 1633 completed the slavery of the other classes, by proclaiming the principle that "the air enslaves the man," in virtue of which every peasant who had lived for a year upon the estate of a noble was held to be his property.

Nowhere in history—nowhere in the world—do we ever see a homogeneous nation organise itself in a form like that which has prevailed from the earliest times in Poland. But where there has been an intrusion of a dominant people, or settlers, who have not fused into the original population, there we find

an exact counterpart of Polish society: the dominant settlers establishing themselves as an upper caste, all politically equal among themselves, and holding the lands (or, more frequently, simply drawing the rents) of the country. A curious example of this, and an exact parallel to the case of Poland, is to be found in the *Meerassee* village system of southern India, by which a certain class draw and share the rents of the land, equals among themselves, and regarding the rest of the community as their servants,—a system which to this day indicates the presence of immigrant tribes from Upper India, Brahmins and Rajpoots, here settled as oligarchs amongst an inferior population. A recent writer on this subject remarks:

“All races, however republican in practice at home, tend to develop this Meerassee system of tenure—this aristocracy of equality—when they settle as conquerors among another race. It is especially characteristic of the Indo-Teutonic peoples, into whatever country they have entered as conquerors. The so-called democracy of Athens was in reality a republican aristocracy resting upon a basis of slavery. In a more diffused and consequently less intense form, so also were the Franks in Gaul—a fact expressed for centuries by the distinction between *noble* and *roturier*, and which was only terminated by the French Revolution; when the expulsion of the noblesse was in reality a throwing-off of the stable Teutonic governing caste, leaving the government thereafter to the mobile impulses of a Celtic people.”

Moreover, speaking of the Brahmanical migrations, the same writer says:

“Although the conquering and dominant immigrants kept themselves very much apart from the general population, alike by social and religious distinctions, the result of these migrations was an infusion of Aryan blood, and still more of Aryan civilisation, amongst the pre-Aryan people of southern India.”*

These remarks exactly express the view which we entertain in regard to the population of Poland. There we find an aristocracy of equals resting upon a basis of serfage, an upper caste drawing the rents of the land, monopolising the government, and composing the army of the country, and who, in the course of long centuries, have imparted much of their own spirit and ideas, and, with the license of a gay aristocracy, not a little of their blood also, to the subordinate population. In all cases, the way in which an amalgamation between a band of conquerors and a conquered people takes place, is such as to give a great advantage to the former. The sons of the conquerors may wed the daughters of the conquered for the sake of their lands; but it is comparatively seldom that

* Patterson's *Essays in History and Art*, article “India: its Castes and Creeds,” p. 461.

the daughters of the invaders condescend to tarnish their escutcheon by becoming wedded to, and merged in, the class of the vanquished. And thus an originally small number of conquerors may for long perpetuate their line, and increase its numbers in comparative purity, even though surrounded by myriads of a different race. Each one of the invaders becomes a noble, or upper-caste man ; and when they make exceptions to the practice of intermarrying among themselves, it is only that they may more widely diffuse their lineaments by forming unions with the female portion of the native race. Indeed, it is not improbable that the old feudal law, which placed the person of a female vassal at the disposal of the seigneur on her wedding-night, had its origin in political motives as well as in tyrannous lust. In Poland, the line of demarcation between the dominant and subject races appears to have been very rigidly maintained, and doubtless among the peasantry and inferior classes the blood of the *Sliachta* or true *Lekhs* is only to be found in such proportion as may have been produced by the numerous informal unions formed by a gay and licentious nobility with the women on their estates. To what extent this may have affected the blood and lineaments of the people during a dozen centuries is not sufficiently determined; but it would seem that the general population has become so imbued with the ideas and customs, and so associated with the history and fortunes, of the dominant class, that the original distinction between the two has virtually disappeared, except in so far as it is maintained by the diversity or antagonism of interests arising from their different social positions. Nevertheless we regard the Polish nobility, or freemen, as Slavonians only in language, and from the influence exerted upon them by the race among whom they settled ; and their adoption of the Slavonian language is what was to be expected, seeing that at first they were but a handful compared to the native population of the Sarmatian plain. As it seems to us, the ancestors of the ruling class in Poland were a handful of gay, warlike, and high-spirited immigrants, who settled among the Slavonians in Poland somewhat in the same manner as the Hungarians did among the same race on the banks of the Danube. Only the Hungarians came as a nation, and the *Lekhs* as a small band of adventurers, who rose into notice slowly and unseen. We may add, that there is no small resemblance of national character between the Poles and Hungarians—the same haughty spirit, the same gallantry, love of freedom, and aptitude for war ; only the Poles are cast in a more mobile mould than the stately Hungarian.

One of the most striking aspects of the Polish race, or

rather of the Polish upper caste, is its wide and influential diffusion compared with the smallness of its numbers. There is a strong Polish element in Lithuania, Galicia, Volhynia, and to some extent also in the Ukraine, the influence of which is making itself felt in the present rebellion. The explanation is that the Poles (by which term we again mean the Sliachta, or upper caste, who did all the fighting and governing) made themselves supreme in these adjoining countries, establishing members of their class as territorial magnates or petty suzerains in the provinces thus added to their kingdom. In truth, the interest or necessity which they had to provide for the increasing numbers of their class, must have had a great influence in producing those wars of aggression which mark the career of the Polish nobility. Poland had been parcelled out among them, so that no new estates could be made save by dividing those already in existence; nor was it customary for a member of the Sliachta to be any thing else than a landowner, a soldier, or an *homme-d'état*. The fact that during war the serfs remained at home to till the ground, while the armies were composed of the class of "nobles," or, as we should prefer to call them, the freemen of the nation, must have tended greatly to keep down the numbers of the dominant class; nevertheless a pauperised class of the privileged race would have unquestionably arisen in course of time, if the conquest of new provinces had not afforded a means of providing for them new estates. And thus the Poles are spread sporadically over a very wide region compared with the limits of the present "kingdom;" and both by their position as territorial magnates, and by the influence of a higher organisation and superior culture, they have in no small degree associated with themselves the sympathies of the non-Polish population, among whom they have long dwelt.

The Slavonians, who are the most numerous race in Europe, also present greater diversities of physical appearance than any other. The northern Russians are fair, with light hair; the Croats and Servians of the south are dark, with black eyes and hair; the Slovaks of Hungary, living almost in the same latitude with the Croats and Servians, have flaxen hair, with strong coarse features; and the Poles, for the most part, have dark eyes and hair, with tall well-made figures. The Celts, however, present an almost equal amount of physical diversity, but rather sporadically than as marking distinct sections of their race. And if, turning from the minor divisions of mankind, we look at the great families of nations—the Indo-European, the Semitic, and the Turanian—the internal diversities, alike of character and appearance, become so important as

to show that ethnographic classification, which at present is based only on philology, is a very inadequate exponent of the characteristics of mankind. The Turk and the Chinese are really the antipodes of one another; and the English and Dutch present greater resemblances of character to the Chinese than to the Hindoos, who are rightly classed with them as members of the Indo-European family. There is a question at present as regards Race—one school of thoughtful writers exalting it as the prime influence which determines national character, while another school ignores it altogether. The latter school, which appears to be gaining ground, regards climate and civilisation as the only great influences which affect the races of mankind. We have no doubt that the character of the countries in which they settled, and the circumstances which environed them, were the sole influences which originally produced the diversities of mankind which we now behold. But it is equally certain that the effect of these influences upon nations is not evanescent, and that the national character and features acquired under those influences will long continue prevalent among offshoots of a nation who have migrated to another country and become subjected to other circumstances. Many striking instances attest the permanency of racial character after it has once been thoroughly formed. The Red Indians of America are an example of this on a great scale; and the Gipsies, if possible still more remarkably, illustrate the same truth in the case of a people who are scattered in little bands all over the world. Climate and the physical features of a country may be most powerful, if not all-powerful, in determining the character of a people in its earliest stage of existence; but unfortunately for writers like Mr. Buckle, who extol these influences as supreme, we rarely catch sight of any nation at such a stage; and in those cases where a nation has grown up from its cradle beneath the eye of history, we find that its career has been influenced by a variety of other causes much more powerful.

In regard to the old nations of the world, when the light of history breaks upon them, we find that migrations and interminglings have already taken place. Every people is changing, or has already changed, its locality, and therefore is carrying with it into a new region a type which it has acquired in a previous one. Indeed, even if we were to grant the strange hypothesis of the American school of ethnologists, that races are indigenous to the soil, and were to regard every people as autochthons whom we find already settled when the light of history first breaks upon them, the concession would nevertheless be worthless as a proof of the dependence of na-

tional character and appearance simply upon the physical and climatic conditions. For even in the case of the ancient Egyptians—veritable autochthons in the estimation of Messrs. Nott and Gliddon—it can be shown that interminglings of population had taken place in the valley of the Nile, and that even if the earliest settlers there did not come from another country, they had at least been intermingled with others who certainly did so. The history of mankind, if we trace it back even to the earliest times, exhibits a ceaseless succession of migrations and interminglings of peoples; and we witness the same process going on in full force at the present day. It is a vain task, therefore, to seek to divide mankind into sharply-defined sections, whether as regards language, national character, or physical appearance. Nations are very composite bodies, however perfect they may be as political unities. And the interminglings of blood which so frequently affect the early condition of a nation are, in the later stages of national life (especially in modern times), succeeded by an intermingling of ideas and usages, which are hardly less potent in modifying the national character. As civilisation matures and the means of locomotion increase, contiguous nations lose some of their individualising characteristics and increase in mutual resemblance. They begin to suppress what is local, and to cultivate what is general. In the early times of the world, when locomotion was difficult and nations were comparatively isolated, civilisation produced diversity; in the later times, it produces harmony. The explanation is simple. Civilisation beginning when nations are isolated takes the peculiar complexion of each people pure and simple; it brings out the mind and develops the idiosyncrasy of a people, and increases their individuality by giving them a formal religion, laws, government, and historical traditions. In this way the undeveloped idiosyncrasy of a barbarous people becomes expanded, and takes shape in many peculiar and settled forms; even as the pebbles of the brook, however externally alike, show striking differences of structure when polished by the lapidary. But in later times civilisation exerts an opposite influence, and begins to soften and harmonise the differences existing among mankind. And this it does, first, by bringing men into contact, and, secondly, by teaching them to agree on great points, and to agree to differ upon small ones. Thus the variety which arises in the world in early times is becoming gradually subordinated, in the scheme of Providence, to a grand and beautiful harmony, of which we of the present day behold but the faint beginnings.

All races are fruitful with one another. All races seem to be able to perpetuate their line in any new country or climate.

All of them, too, blend into one another, by gradations too subtle to be sharply marked off. And this is true not only of portions of races which are contiguous, but even of some which are far apart. The physical features of one race reappear in another family of mankind, sometimes under the most different circumstances both of climate and civilisation. The Fellatah and some other tribes of central Africa have perfect European features and very handsome figures,—the only difference is that they are black; yet they have had no connexion whatever with the Indo-European race. Other instances of a similar kind exist. Moreover, almost every large nation contains within itself individual types which (except as regards colour) correspond to almost every national type in existence. Physical degeneration, it is well known, produces types in small numbers from a given nation which resemble the types of degraded nations elsewhere. "On one of the Fernando Islands," says Webster, "is a Portuguese penal colony. The men have become so degenerated that they have abandoned agriculture, and do not even possess a boat—a depth of misery which the lowest South-Sea Islanders have not reached. The same is true of the Portuguese on the coasts of eastern Africa: they have become as lazy and barbarous as the lowest native Negroes, and yet they were once one of the leading maritime peoples of Europe. It is said also that in Equador, in the province of Loxa, there are wild barbarous Spaniards, of entirely unmixed blood, who have lost every trace of historic tradition (Tschudi). The Arabians were once the most powerful of the Semitic races, and stamped their influence on the civilisation of the globe; yet in Socotra they are said to have become so degraded and inactive as not even to possess a boat. In Nubia they are thought to be more lazy, and less capable of invention and enterprise, than Negroes (Waitz), and they live in the greatest misery" (Brace, pp. 370-1). And in like manner, inferior nations sometimes produce individuals presenting the perfect type of the highest race. The superiority of some races to others is not so substantial as is generally supposed. The military qualities and the capacity for governing are the qualities which chiefly determine a nation's position in the world; but nations may excel in those which are deficient in many other not less valuable qualities. The Indo-European race has never produced so populous, well-organised, and enduring an empire as that of China, and it is only since the commencement of this century that even the foremost of European nations have begun to equal and surpass it in the arts of peaceful industry. The Turk, again, though of the same stock (so far as philology shows) as the Chinese, has excelled in the very opposite qualities, and has exhibited a capacity for govern-

ing other nations only second to the Roman, and perhaps to the Briton. It is in the realm of pure intellect alone, and latterly in the kindred sphere of mechanical invention, that the Indo-European nations can claim a distinctive and undisputed superiority. In point of physical appearance, though superior in the mass, they are equalled, indeed excelled, by some nations belonging to the other races. Physically, the finest people in Europe are probably the Magyars, who belong to the Turanian family of mankind; the upper classes of the Turks, who belong to the same stock, but who have been improved by intermarriages, are equal to any Europeans in handsomeness of face and figure; and the Arabs of north Africa, who belong to the Semitic race, are second to no nation in physical appearance. The Arabs of north Africa, says Mr. Brace, are "a strongly-built race, as tall as the Scotch Highlanders. Their face is usually sunburnt, with white and handsome teeth, and black eyes of a proud and fearless expression, a short beard and moustache; their deportment is daring and commanding. Many travellers consider them the handsomest race in the world." Of the Magyars he says, "Though not a tall people, they show almost the perfection of muscular form; the features are regular, and their faces are often remarkably handsome; the hair and eyes are dark, with usually a harsh complexion, though occasionally slight, and the beard is generally full and dark. There is no finer race, physically, in Europe." And of the moral and mental qualities of this Turanian nation, he justly says that "the practical talent which they have manifested, and their political skill during so many centuries, together with the sound morality and unshaken patriotism displayed in their individual and national misfortunes, is an evidence that the high qualities of the Aryan races are shared by some of the other families of man." Of the capacities of the Asiatic peoples we can speak with an approximation to certainty, for their native talents and tendencies have been displayed in their civilisations; but of the future of the African nations we can predicate little or nothing; for they are still in a wholly undeveloped condition, and the only section of them with whom we are well acquainted are the enslaved Negroes of Congou, who are known to belong to the lowest of the great divisions of African population.

It is obvious, then, that neither physical appearance nor psychological development can be accepted as adequate tests of Race. Judged only by these tests, it is difficult to establish any resemblance between the Chinese on the one hand and the Turk and Magyar on the other; between the Dutchman and the Hindoo; or even between the Semite of Arabia and

his stalwart kinsman of some parts of north Africa. Accordingly, of late years ethnologists have preferred to discriminate between the various families of mankind by means of Language. Language is a species of fossilised history. By observing what words the members of each group of nations have in common, we can in an approximate degree ascertain the relative epochs at which each of these nations diverged from the parent stock, and the stage of development which they had attained at that epoch. The words which they have in common show what was the mode of life, whether pastoral or agricultural, or both; how far they had advanced in the arts of life; whether or not they had beheld the sea and engaged in navigation; and how far their intellectual development had proceeded before each parted company with the other. Thus, by means of comparative philology, we can obtain a dim but interesting view of early times, which but for this new science must have remained hid from our sight. The inflexions of grammar also—the modes in which each people put together their words and construct their sentences—is another means of discovering early relationships. Nevertheless it must be admitted that Language also is but an imperfect test in ethnography. Its great advantage is, that it presents a means of establishing much wider ethnological relationships than is afforded by any other test, and is therefore valuable as simplifying the classification of the varieties of mankind. But it has its weak points; and some eminent authorities, as Mr. Crawford and M. Agassiz, do not hesitate to deny altogether its validity as an ethnological test. Both of these authorities carry their scepticism too far; but unquestionably there is much truth in the lesser form of objection stated by Professor Pott of Germany. Both Mr. Crawford and Professor Agassiz deny the original unity of mankind; but it is the hypothesis of the unity of mankind that really affords the strongest argument against the validity of language as a test of race. Since all mankind had a common origin and nature, it is not unreasonable to suppose that tribes or peoples, in a similar stage of development, however widely apart, will express themselves in similar or analogous forms. This consideration throws much doubt upon the relationships which philologists seek to establish between the native tribes of America, some of the African tribes, and even some of the ruder peoples of the Indian peninsula, on the one hand, and the great Turanian and Semitic families on the other. Nevertheless these difficulties, important as they are, only affect the relationship of the more barbarous peoples of the earth. Between all the civilised nations, whether of Turanian, Semitic, or Indo-European stock, language

affords a tolerably safe test of community or diversity of race. And although there is every reason to believe that eventually the roots of the Semitic and the Aryan languages will be demonstrated to be from one source; and although many remarkable coincidences have already been discovered between the Turanian roots and those of the other two families,—this is only what was to be expected on the ground of the common origin of mankind; and this remote convergence of the three great families of language into one does not prevent the striking varieties and antagonisms of language which we find existing throughout the historic period from being accepted as valuable and reliable tests of racial and national diversity.

No controversy of the day is so keenly waged as that which relates to the origin of species and varieties, alike in the animal and vegetable kingdoms and in the human race. Mr. Brace thus states in outline the process which accompanies the establishment of a new type or variety of mankind, or rather the change of one national type into another:

“Suppose, in some very remote age of the past, long before the received commencement of human annals, an Asiatic tribe, of some intermediate type between all the present races of men, had emigrated to an entirely new country and climate—say to the east of Africa. All the external influences on the physique of this tribe are changed; the soil (for soil is found to have an important effect on human constitutions), the water, the temperature, the scenery, the miasmatic influence, the electrical, the moral influences, in their different pursuits and means of livelihood—all are different from what they have been. From these, or from some other cause with which we are unacquainted, a slight variety appears in the offspring; it may, possibly, be some change in internal structure, fitting the possessors to resist better the destructive influences of the new climate and soil; this change may be accompanied, as a correlating feature, with a slightly darker shade of colour, or a minute change in the hair, or the outward structure of the body. Those children who, from unknown causes, have acquired this almost imperceptible advantage are, of course, more likely to survive. Their children again, on the principle of inheritance, will, in the first place, tend to be like their immediate parents, but they will also tend in a less degree to be like all their parents; so that the ‘attractions’ of resemblance will, in some cases, be compounded of the closer and stronger attraction towards the variety, and that toward all the ancestors, or the type of the species. The resultant will naturally be some new variety of colour or structure. In this way we can understand how, for a given time, there might be started many varieties of man, after once the variation had begun. This would go on for a certain period, perhaps during many centuries, and there would be only two limits to the new varieties: one would be the principle of *inheritance*, which would always make the children like their long line of ancestors,

and thus keep the type of the species, and preserve the child from changing into any thing but a Man; and the other, the advantage of the variations to their possessors" (pp. 387-8).

This is not a mere theory. It is the statement of a process which we see clearly, and in abundance of cases, going on among plants and animals, producing varieties far greater than any which are to be found in the human race. And if the same process of change is less observable by us among the tribes of mankind, this is due to the fact that the organisation of man is better fitted to meet changes of climate and condition, and that the resources which civilisation places at his disposal enable him still more to resist the influence of such changes. Hence the changes of physical appearance in mankind take place, in general, very slowly. As an example of the permanence of type which is sometimes maintained by a people, in spite of a great but temporary mingling of blood into other races, we may refer to the Copts, and still more to the Fellahs, or Mohammedan portion of the peasantry of Egypt. Mr. Brace says :

"The physical history of the Egyptians—if the statements of Gliddon and Pulszky and others be correct—is an instance of the power of the principle of Inheritance in a given race to preserve the type pure, despite certain mixtures with other races. . . . During many centuries this [the Egyptian] type was constantly modified in the higher classes by crossings with other races; first with the Semitic, under the Phœnician and Canaanite immigrations and conquests; then with the Aryan, under Macedonian, Greek, and Roman invasions; until at length the country fell under the Mohammedan rule, and the Fellahs embraced the faith of the Prophet. Under this new religion they were forbidden to intermarry with strangers, so that since the 7th century the population of Egypt—with the exception of some slight Arabic mixture—has recruited itself by intermarriage within its own limits; and the process has again gone on undisturbed of adapting the physique to its situation and circumstances, and of bringing back the original type. And now, after great variations of type during past centuries, we have restored the pure antique Egyptian type, closely corresponding to one prominent type represented in the oldest sculpture and painting, and characterising a variety of men, which is the only human race out of the many that have temporarily occupied Egyptian soil, that has had time to perpetuate itself" (pp. 190-1).

This is a good example of the way in which a mixture of foreign blood is ultimately eliminated from a people—the foreign type thus introduced being gradually overpowered, and giving place to the old type, in consequence of the numerical preponderance of the latter. An equally good example of the opposite case—namely, of a complete fusion of different races—is presented in England, where Celts, Germans, and Scandina-

vians have become so completely amalgamated that the original lines of demarcation have disappeared, and a new nation has been originated. Sometimes, but rarely, the partial union of two different races has produced a tribe or nation of half-breeds, which, without intermarrying with either of its progenitors, has assumed a distinct and separate existence of its own: as, for example, the Griquas of South Africa, a cross between the Dutch and the Hottentots, and the tribe of half-breeds, a cross between the European settlers and the Indians, which have established themselves as a separate community on the Red River, in the Hudson's Bay territory.

The careful investigations of Dr. Wilson of Toronto have satisfactorily demolished the theory, hitherto so resolutely maintained by the supporters of the doctrine of the original diversity of races, that no new variety of mankind can be established by the sexual union of different races, and that the offspring of such crossing speedily die out, or return to the type of one or other of their progenitors. But the strongest objection which this school of ethnologists urge against the original unity of mankind relates to the other, and more extensive, of the two great influences productive of human varieties. They deny that any change of climate, country, or conditions of life can produce the varieties of mankind which we see in the world. A certain type of mankind, if transplanted to a different country and climate, they maintain, will die out, but cannot change its type. They point to the ancient monuments of Egypt, whereon the different types of man in the Old World,—the low Negro type, the Semitic, the brown Turanian, and the white Aryan,—are pictured exactly as they exist at the present day. The Negro had then, as now, his black skin, his thick lips, protruding jaw, and curved legs; the Semite his bent nose; the Egyptian his bronze complexion and voluptuous lips; the Aryan his white skin and noble features: and they ask, Why is it to be thought that these diversities did not exist from the beginning? Who ever sees, they ask, a race-type changing? When did a European ever become a Negro, or when has the Ethiopian changed his skin? Where has a Red Indian ever passed into a white; or who ever hears of an Englishman becoming black under the tropics? Where even has a Jew of pure blood acquired a Greek or English type of features? Where, in short, is the process going on which shall convert one race-type into another? That the power of race is strong, and that the effects of climate *alone* are not sufficient to account for the diversities of human appearance, must be admitted. Mr. Brace observes:

“Such is the power of race, or of the principle of Inheritance, that

we are not surprised at finding the probable descendants of the ancient Vandals in North Africa still blonde with blue eyes, and the North-American Negro as black as his Congo ancestor 200 years ago. So, again, we find the Mexicans, in their comparatively cool districts, darker than the native races of the hottest countries of South America ; and the Guaiacas, at the sources of the Orinoco, whiter than the Indians in precisely the same latitude and circumstances (Waitz, *Anthropologie*). Neither does height always necessarily cause a lighter complexion,—as witness some tribes on the mountains around the Gulf of Guinea, and the inhabitants of the mountains of New Guinea and the Philippines, as well as many other islands of Oceanica, who are as black as the blackest Negroes that dwell on the plains. The Malayan race has the same complexion, stature, and features on the Equator and twenty degrees away from it ; in mountainous highlands as in level islands. The colour of the Malays under the Equator is nearly the same with that of the Esquimaux of the Arctic Circle. ‘At the same distance from the Equator,’ says Crawford, ‘we find fair Europeans, yellow Chinese, red Americans, and black Australians’ ” (pp. 390-1).

But if the effects of climate alone are inadequate to explain the diversities of appearance in mankind, it must be remembered that climate, *i.e.* atmospheric influences, is only one of many agencies which affect the condition and appearance of nations. We are inclined to believe that the geological structure of each country greatly affects the type, and that metaliferous regions, which are always in part mountainous, are especially favourable to the development of the human organism. The kind, as well as the quantity, of food also is known to have an influence on man's appearance; and the kind and degree of civilisation has a similar influence. Mental development and moral habits exert a notable effect upon the appearance of individual man, and they cannot fail to affect nations in a similar manner. “We are of yesterday, and know nothing.” Our scientific observation is limited to a very narrow range of time. But even within that period, and within our (until recently) narrow ken of humanity, some changes of human type have unquestionably taken place. In the time of the Romans, the Kelts were tall, large-boned, and fair-complexioned, with red hair and blue eyes ; whereas the type now is a small frame, with dark hair, comparatively swarthy complexion, with darkish or black eyes. Some clans of the Scottish Highlanders alone correspond to the ancient type. A change has also taken place during the same period in the appearance of the Germans. The yellow hair and blue eyes which marked them in the time of the Roman historians have now, says Niebuhr, “in most parts of Germany, become uncommon. I have seen a considerable number of persons assembled in a large room at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, and observed that,

except one or two Englishmen, there was not an individual among them who had not dark hair." No doubt the climate of Germany has changed since it was cleared of its forests; and the condition of the people has likewise been greatly changed by the agencies of civilisation. In our own country, a similar change is observable in the gradual darkening of the hair and eyes. Mr. Brace, who is an American, states that a change is taking place in the appearance of the English race in the New World, although he maintains that the change is not a deterioration. Anyhow there is a change: the men are spare in figure, with universally lank hair; and without going the length of not a few ethnologists, who imagine that they can already discern an approximation of the Americans, both mentally and bodily, to the Red-Indian type, we cannot help thinking that the type of Heenan (whose parents were fresh from the Emerald Isle) will gradually disappear, and give place to one more resembling that of Deerfoot, the spare, angular, agile Seneca Indian, who has borne off the palm from the best runners in this country.

The change in the appearance of the Kelts since the time of Cæsar can hardly be accounted less than an actual change of race-type, although some of it may be due to a mixture of alien blood. And that the other changes which we have alluded to, and which we actually see in progress, may continue, and ultimately produce a fundamental alteration of appearance, is extremely probable. Moreover, in early times, such changes doubtless took place much more readily than now. There is a youth of nations as well as of individuals. There is no doubt a limit to the amount of change, mental as well as bodily, which every man can undergo or develop; and, *ceteris paribus*, the more changes that have taken place on him, the less able will he be to develop or undergo others. We conceive that the same is true of peoples. Every change of country and climate, for example, causes at least a temporary weakening of the physical constitution, diminishes its natural range of variation, and renders a people less fitted to undergo other changes of a like kind. This principle, we believe, furnishes the best explanation of the curious fact, now generally admitted, that pure races like the Chinese, Jews, and Gipsies stand changes of country and climate better than any others. The physical constitution of early mankind must have been more pliable, more ready to receive external impressions and accommodate itself to external influences, than in later times, when a national type had become formed and fixed, and the whole organisation of the people, both mental and physical, had for long centuries been cast in a certain mould. This

much at least is certain, that there are but two factors in the production of a racial type—blood and circumstances. Blood is the influence of the past—circumstances, of the present. If we undervalue the influence of race on the character and career of a nation, the influence of circumstances, and of local peculiarities, is raised thereby into greater importance, and *vice versâ*. Whatever is taken from blood must be given to circumstances; whatever is denied to the power of circumstances must be ascribed to the influence of blood.

The question has often presented itself to historians, Why do nations die? Is mortality a condition of their existence, or is it but an accident? Reasoning from analogy may be multiplied abundantly on both sides of the question. But, as regards the facts of history, there is one case, and one only, albeit a very weighty one, which can be quoted in opposition to the theory that nations, as well as individuals, must die. The case is that of China, where, from the earliest times of which we have any knowledge, a people has gone on increasing in numbers, and maintaining its national existence, down to the present day; and of which we may truly say, that although it is possible to imagine a time when that empire may be directed by Europeans, it surpasses any ordinary imagination to conceive of that vast population, numbering one-third of the whole human race, becoming extinct or ceasing to be Chinese. So far as facts go, China furnishes a strong argument against the doctrine of national mortality. But, for this one old nation that has lived and still lives, there are half-a-dozen others which have perished. The Babylonians and the Assyrians are dead and gone: not a single living trace of them exists. The national existence of the ancient Egyptians passed away (we may say) sixteen hundred years ago. The Greek nation ceased to exist long ago; and its blood has become so mixed, and its country so changed, that if it should revive again, it will rather be as a new people than as a continuation of its former existence. The Romans were but a tribe—their empire was that of a polity rather than of a people; and both polity and people have disappeared. In the New World, the mortality of nations has been still more strikingly displayed. The Mayans of Central America, the old Peruvians, the Toltecs and Aztecs of Mexico, have ceased to exist; and even the barbarous nomades are melting away before the advance of the new-comers from Europe.

But if the question of national mortality is not conclusively determinable, we need not be at a loss to discern the chief causes which produce that mortality. Unquestionably the great prophylactic against national death, the great support of national longevity, is a numerous population. A people

which at the outset has a wide region to settle in,—uninhabited save by a few forest-tribes who withdraw before them, and isolated from the attack of any other organised nation,—may so increase in numbers and in civilisation, and so consolidate itself by social and political organisation, that before the period of its isolation is at an end, its unity and its vastness render it virtually indestructible. Such has been the case of China. But when peoples number only a few millions, like the old nations who grew up in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates, and are open to attack from powerful rivals, the probability is that they will be gradually exhausted in the conflict. Greece exhausted herself by her very triumphs; the Romans disappeared by spreading themselves over a subject world. The fate of Egypt and of the old empires of Mesopotamia show us national overthrow and decay in their completest form. The wars which accompanied their overthrow, and the ruthlessness or barbarism of the invaders, destroyed or allowed to fall into ruins the canals and other works of irrigation, upon which depended the fertility of the country; and the spirit of the people was too much broken to struggle against and repair the calamity. Conceive the case of a man advanced in years who suddenly finds his wealth gone, the labour and glory of his life destroyed, his freedom and self-respect exchanged for humiliation and subjection: what heart has he left to struggle with his misfortunes? Is he not most likely to sit down amidst the ruins, like Job amidst his ashes, and bow his head in the quiescence of despair as the billows of his overwhelming calamity break over him? Even such must have been the feeling of those old nations—Egyptians, Babylonians, Aztecs, Peruvians—when they beheld their empire overthrown, their old glory gone, their very means of subsistence failing them, and a haughty, in their eyes barbarous, race jostling them in the streets, plundering their wealth, and treading them and their children in the dust. “The effect on the spirits and temperament which the contrast of a different and more fortunate people causes,” observes Mr. Brace, “must not be understood to be a poetic or sentimental statement. It is a scientific consideration now, in explaining the diminution of any barbarous or inferior race in presence of a more powerful one.” In the case of the North-American Indian, he adds, “*melancholy* is to be set down in the drier statistical list of the causes of his decline.” The moral depression caused by subjection to an alien race, the destruction of wealth and material prosperity generally consequent upon conquest, the change which takes place in the aspect of the country,—all tend to produce a diminution of the population, and ulti-

mately national death. Sometimes, as we have said, the decay is produced by the drafting away of the flower of a race in foreign conquests; but such decay may be only temporary, unless (as in the case of Greece) it be accompanied by an influx of inferior population, mingling its blood with that of the decaying lordly race.

Lord Russell once, objecting to Macaulay's picture of a New-Zealander one day meditating among the ruins of London, as Marius amidst fallen Carthage, or Layard over buried Nineveh, said boldly, "No,—if London Bridge be broken down, the Londoners will build it up again; if St. Paul's become dilapidated, they will renovate it." But it is the saying of a statesman, not of a philosopher; the confidence marks a man who is too absorbed in his own times to appreciate the wider lessons of history. It is the boast of one who, seeing with delight the manifold activities and ever-renewed energy of this goodly nation, is too proud of it to bear the thought that it too may die. By a possibility the boast may prove true; but it is far too confident for the philosophic historian, who sees that time writes its wrinkles on the brow of nations as of men, and that there is a law of death for societies as well as for the units who compose them. But in this much, certainly, our country is fortunate, inasmuch as its insular position constitutes a bulwark of independence such as no great nation ever before enjoyed, and forms a barrier against the influx of large hordes or hosts which, by commixture, might deteriorate the national type. What the British race needs in order to attain longevity is, first, independence, that our high spirits may be unbroken, and our wills and energies free. Secondly, a steady but not excessive emigration, such as may relieve the labour-market without depleting it; so that the material comfort of the people may not retrograde, but continue advancing with the progress of science and civilisation, and that we may escape that diminution of marriages, and of births to marriages, which, whether due to necessity, selfishness, or corruption, usually marks that period of stagnation which forms the first stage of national decay. As long as our population increases at its present rate, and emigration takes off the surplus, not only will our internal condition remain sound and healthy, but every year we are adding to the number of our race in other countries, and thereby multiplying the number of our friends and customers. What is to be the lot of the colonies thus sprung from our loins, and planted wide apart in the most distant quarters of the earth, we do not pretend to say. That their career will be glorious we do not doubt; that the parent isles will in future ages lose their supremacy, and become but a member of the galaxy of Anglo-

Saxon powers that will then bridge the seas and span the globe, we believe. But what of those offshoots ethnologically? Will the British race thrive as well in their new homes as in their old? We think not. They may indeed find elsewhere greater opportunities, and possibly may attain greater power; our offspring in America, for example, have a whole continent to expand in, while we have but two small islands. Nevertheless, whatever may be the future aggregate power of the Anglo-Americans, we see no reason to believe that, man for man, they will equal, either in physical or psychological qualities, the parent-stock. Were we asked to name the two places in the world most favourable for the perpetuation of the pure British stock, we should say New Zealand and Japan, both of which countries are insular, metalliferous, and in nearly the same climate and latitude as the British Isles. Both of these countries also are remarkable for producing the finest type of the races to which their inhabitants belong. Besides New Zealand and Japan, British Columbia and Upper Canada seem to us favourable localities for the preservation of the British type; and of Upper Canada especially the peninsula lying between Lakes Huron, Erie, and Ontario, and having for base a line drawn from Kingston to Georgia Bay.

However unable we of the present day may be to decide conclusively some of the more important questions relating to race and changes of race-types, future generations will be more fortunate, and if they do not approve our theories, they will at least benefit by the facts which we are providing for them. It is seldom that a new nation is ever born suddenly into the world. It generally grows up almost unnoticed, so that its early stages of development pass uncriticised and unrecorded. But the present is peculiarly an epoch of the birth of new nations. Not, indeed, of peoples rising out of barbarism into civilisation, but of new combinations of races, aggregating and segregating themselves under new conditions of country and climate. The British race especially has spread itself over the world, and is rearing new empires in the most widely distant parts of the earth. The leadership of the races of the Old World has at length centred in Europe, and the nations of Europe are mingling together in most novel circumstances, giving rise to new states and peoples in the solitudes of the New World discovered by Columbus. Civilisation can only attain maturity in countries of large cities and dense population; and as Europe was destined by Providence to be the seed-bed from which civilisation was to be transplanted into the world's waste places, it behoved that the ocean which shut in our continent on the west should for long be impassable by its

nations. But as soon as the ripening process was sufficiently advanced,—when commerce demanded more gold and silver for its expansion, and religion needed a refuge from persecution,—the heaven-sent dream of Columbus opened up a new world which supplied both, and presented a field where civilisation might develop into new forms. Ever since then America has taken off the surplus and overboilings of European society, until emigration at length began to raise a barrier against itself,—even as the influx of a river into the sea raises a sand-bank at its mouth to check its course. Population had spread so far inland in eastern America that it cost as much money to carry emigrants through the settled country to the backwoods as to convey them across the Atlantic. This obstacle was yearly increasing, when appalling famine and misery in Ireland, and horrible convulsions on the Continent, began to drive hundreds of thousands from their homes. America seemed barred against them, when suddenly, contemporaneously with all this misery in Europe, there occurred that memorable discovery of gold in unheard-of abundance on the distant shores of the Pacific, and thousands of the exiles from Europe, and tens of thousands from eastern America, flocked eagerly to the golden land. The *auri sacra fames*—now, even more than in ancient times, the great lever for moving mankind—has of late years been guiding man into the seats of his future glory, and is placing him on the throne of a new world. The races of the Old World have become strangely blended in the New; but it is in California that this commingling has reached its maximum, and has laid the foundation of a new nation. Emigrants from every country in Europe—English, Irish, Scotch, German, Swiss, Pole, French, Spaniard—flocked thither, to work side by side with the Indian tribes and Anglo-Americans, and with the native Chilians and half-breeds of the southern portion of the continent. The Australian joined them from his continent in the south, the Malay and Polynesian from the isles of the Pacific; while the Chinaman, come forth like an anchorite from his cell, builds a temple for his idols in San Francisco, and joins in a concourse of human tribes such as the world never before beheld. Even before gold was discovered, and the great immigration commenced, California possessed a strangely mixed population for so outlying a place. “Among the two hundred souls who inhabit Monterey,” wrote Dupetit Thouars in 1843, “there are Creoles sprung from Spaniards and the native women; strangers from all points of the globe,—Scotch, Irish, American, French,—who have taken wives from the half-breeds of whites, and these races are now crossed in such a way that the fusion is complete.” The new nation which is consolidating

itself in California is an assembly of all the others, and the novelty of its elements and of its situation presages the novelty of its future career.

The races of the Old World have launched forth upon a new career, and are seeking new triumphs and new comminglings in a quarter of the globe that hitherto has had no history. It is a singular circumstance that, up to the present times, no great maritime or colonising empire has ever arisen on the shores of the Pacific. Although possessing a length of seaboard far surpassing that of the Atlantic, and gemmed with isles of spontaneous fertility, suitable alike for the seat of colonies or entrepôts, the nations that surround its shores have never embarked an army on its waters, or carried the torch of knowledge over its bosom to other lands. Never, either from the ports of China and India, where powerful states have existed almost from the dawn of history; or from Arabia, where the most warlike and daring empire grew up that the world ever saw; or from the opposite shores of Africa and America, where, with the sole exception of the empire of the Incas, humanity seems hitherto to have stagnated in barbarism—has a nation sent forth colonies to cultivate the isles, or an emperor despatched his navy to capture them. The isles of the several archipelagoes, teeming with fruits and blossoms, floating like baskets of flowers amidst the smooth waters of the Pacific—labyrinths of beauty, where the tides die away in the coloured shadows of gorgeous woods and sunlit mountain peaks, and the waves seem to languish in the embrace of the lovely brides of the sea—those luxuriant islands, where Cybele still sits crowned in their solitudes, have hardly begun to yield their riches to civilised man. But the hand of Providence has brought a new race to the shores of that virgin ocean. England, the queen of the seas, the great colonising power of the world, after building up a mighty empire in India, has sent forth her offspring into the Australian world, and is rearing a British empire at the antipodes. And if from the island-continent of Australia we turn our eyes to the north-west, another offshoot of our race is seen growing into power on the opposite shores of the ocean, and from California the Anglo-Saxon race begins to spread out across the isles to meet its brethren in the south. How sublime that meeting in the heart of the Pacific! Setting out from a little island in the German Ocean, the offspring of England have fought their way through wilderness and over mountain, through tribes of savage men, and athwart the tempests of ocean; they have spanned the globe in their march, they have journeyed from the lands of the rising to the home of the setting sun, and now they are about to reunite amidst the

solitudes of the eastern seas. Since the dispersion of Babel no such meeting has the world witnessed. It is the *dénouement* of an epic—of an epic recounting the long war between Man and Nature, and ending with seating him victorious in her last asylum.

ART. VII.—THE GERMANIC DIET.

AMONGST the states of which the European political system is composed, there are three which, although having, as regards their fellows, all the attributes of individual political existences, are really groups of two or more states connected mechanically, but not, so to speak, chemically united. These are: 1, Norway and Sweden; 2, Switzerland; 3, Germany. The first-mentioned is a unique example of a confederation with a common hereditary sovereign; the second is collected under an elective president, and is ruled by a federal council of seven, which forms the executive, by a states-council or senate of forty-four (two for each canton), and by a national council or lower house, in which each member represents a certain amount of population. It forms thus an organisation closely akin to that of the United States of America before the secession, and is a perfect example of what German political writers mean by a *Bundes-Staat* or federative state. The third is the much looser political organisation of which we propose to give in this paper a somewhat detailed account, and with regard to which we wish, first and foremost, to impress upon our readers that it is emphatically *not* a *Bundes-Staat*, but a *Staaten-Bund*; or, in other words, not a *federative state*, but a *confederation of states*.

The Holy Roman Empire, powerful once, but always much more dignified than powerful, invested as it was with certain vague attributes which had descended from the days when there really were Cæsars, had come in the eighteenth century to be a shadow of its former self, and to deserve the taunt of Voltaire, that it was neither "Holy, nor Roman, nor even an Empire." It is not by organisations of this kind that powerful shocks from without are successfully resisted; and so in 1806 it crumbled to pieces. The Emperor Francis assumed the title of Emperor of Austria, surrendering his infinitely more dignified position; and in the room of the old order Europe saw a chaos of unequal unconnected states, and the Confederation of the Rhine. That organisation, more celebrated than honoured, was called into existence, in the month of July 1806, by the document called "*L'Acte de la Confédération du Rhin*, ou

traité entre sa majesté l'Empereur des Français, Roi d'Italie, et les membres de l'Empire Germanique dénommés dans ce traité." It consisted at first of sixteen members, varying in importance from the King of Bavaria down to the Prince von der Leyen. Within the next three years, however, twenty-three other members adhered to it, so that in the beginning of the year 1810 it comprised a population of fourteen and a half millions, although this number was soon after diminished. It was a purely international union. The central authority of the Confederation had nothing whatever to do with the internal regulations of the various states of which it was composed. Napoleon was its hereditary protector, and reserved to himself the power of summoning the federal assembly, of initiating all discussions in it through its prince-president, the Duke of Dalberg, the right of naming the prince-president, and the right of commanding it to make war or peace. The federal assembly was composed of ambassadors accredited by each state, and was divided into two colleges, the Royal Grand-ducal and the Princely. It had hardly time to develop itself, or to show what were likely to be the results of French influence acting upon a German body-politic; but its tendencies, so far as they showed themselves, were unfavourable to individual and local liberties—despotic and bureaucratic.

The fortunes, however, of the Confederation of the Rhine were destined to be "of hasty growth and blight." Germany, which had been at first paralysed by the success of the French arms, gradually recovered her consciousness, and began to plan a rising when a suitable occasion should present itself. Ere long the disasters of the Great Captain in Spain and in Russia, the successes of Koutusoff and of Wellington, made Leipzig possible, and the allied armies of Central and Eastern Europe rolled across the Rhine. Paris fell, and with it the prestige of the conqueror. The Confederation of the Rhine did not even wait for the final decision of the struggle to dissolve itself; nay, it did not even die by any formal diplomatic act. It melted gradually away, one member after another falling off and joining the victorious march of the avenging hosts.

Germany was now utterly disorganised. The Holy Roman Empire had ceased to exist; the Confederation of the Rhine had followed it; and from the Black Forest to the Russian frontier there was nothing but angry ambitions, vengeance, and fears. If there was ever to be peace again in all these wild regions, it was clearly necessary to create something new. What was to be created was a far more difficult question; but already, on the 30th of May 1814, the powers had come to some sort of understanding, if not with regard to the means to

be pursued, at least with regard to the end to be attained. In the Treaty of Paris we find these words: "*Les états de l'Allemagne seront indépendants et unis par un lien fédératif.*" But how was this to be effected? There were some who wished the Holy Roman Empire to be restored. This was naturally enough the view which found favour with most of the media-tised princes; and many individual thinkers whose interests were not affected had come to the same conclusion. Of course neither Prussia, Bavaria, nor Wurtemberg could look kindly upon a plan so obviously unfavourable to them; but not even Austria really wished it, and indeed it had few powerful friends. Then there was a project of a North and South Germany, with the Main for boundary; but this was very much the reverse of acceptable to the minor princes, who had no idea of being grouped like so many satellites, some around Austria and some around Prussia. Next came a plan of an organisation by circles, the effect of which would have been to have thrown all the power of Germany into the hands of a few of the larger states. To this all the smaller independent states were bitterly opposed, and it broke down, although supported by the great authority of Stein, as well as by Gagern. If Germany had been in a later phase of political development, public opinion would perhaps have forced the sovereigns to consent to the formation of a really united Fatherland, with a powerful executive and a national parliament; but the time for that had not arrived. What was the opposition of a few hundred clear-sighted men, with their few thousand followers, that it should prevail over the will of the masters of so many legions? What these potentates cared most about were their sovereign rights, and the dream of German unity was very readily sacrificed to the determination of each of them to be, as far as he possibly could, absolute master in his own dominions. Therefore it was that it soon became evident that the results of the deliberation on the future of Germany would be, not a federative state, but a confederation of states—a Staaten-Bund, not a Bundes-Staat. There is no doubt, however, that much mischief might have been avoided if all the stronger powers had worked conscientiously together to give to this Staaten-Bund as national a character as possible; to gratify as far as they could the natural desire of most active-minded Germans that their country, which covers so large a space of the map of Europe, should play a part in Europe somewhat commensurate with its vast extent; and that the internal arrangements of the different states should, as regards commerce, justice, postal communications, and many other matters, be one and the same. Prussia was really honestly desirous to effect something of this kind, and Stein, Hardenberg,

William von Humboldt, Count Münster, and other statesmen, laboured hard to bring it about. Austria, on the other hand, aided by Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and Baden, did all she could to oppose such projects. Things would perhaps have been settled better than they ultimately were, if the return of Napoleon from Elba had not frightened all Europe from its propriety, and turned the attention of the sovereigns towards warlike preparations. It was perfectly natural that the internal arrangements of the Confederation should be slurred over when all men's thoughts were directed towards the new struggle which had commenced.

The document by which the Germanic Confederation is created is of so much importance that we may say a word about the various stages through which it passed. First, then, it appears as a paper drawn up by Stein in March 1814, and submitted to Hardenberg, Count Münster, and the Emperor Alexander. Next, in the month of September, it took the form of an official plan, handed by Hardenberg to Metternich, and consisting of forty-one articles. This plan contemplated the creation of a confederation which should have the character rather of a *Bundes-Staat* than of a *Staaten-Bund*; but it went to pieces in consequence of the difficulties which we have noticed above, and out of it, and of ten other official proposals, twelve articles were sublimated by the rival chemistry of Hardenberg and Metternich. Upon these twelve articles the representatives of Austria, Prussia, Hanover, and Wurtemberg deliberated. Their sittings were cut short partly by the ominous appearance which was presented in the autumn of 1814 by the Saxon and Polish questions, and partly by the difficulties from the side of Bavaria and Wurtemberg, which we have already noticed. The spring brought a project of the Austrian statesman Wessenberg, who proposed a *Staaten-Bund* rather than a *Bundes-Staat*; and out of this and a new Prussian project drawn up by W. von Humboldt grew the last sketch, which was submitted 23d of May 1815 to the general conference of the plenipotentiaries of all Germany. They made short work of it at the last, and the Federal Act (*Bundes-Act*) bears date June 8th, 1815. This is the document which is incorporated in the principal act of the Congress of Vienna, and placed under the guarantee of eight European powers, including France and England.

Wurtemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Homburg did not form part of the Confederation for some little time—the latter not till 1817; but after they were added to the powers at first consenting, the number of the sovereign states in the Confederation was altogether thirty-nine. The outward and visible sign

of their unity was the presence in Frankfort of representatives from each state forming the Diet, of whose powers and method of conducting business we shall have more to say when we have traced the history of the Confederation to our own times, but which, we may observe in passing, has always been thoroughly inefficient for any good purpose.

The following are the chief stipulations of the Federal Act. The object of the Confederation is the external and internal security of Germany, and the independence and inviolability of the confederate states. A *diète fédérative* (Bundes-Versammlung) is to be created, and its attributions are sketched. The Diet is, as soon as possible, to draw up the fundamental laws of the Confederation. No state is to make war with another on any pretence. All federal territories are mutually guaranteed. There is to be in each state a "Landesständliche Verfassung"—"il y aura des assemblées d'états dans tous les pays de la Confédération." Art. XIV. reserves many rights to the mediatised princes. Religious toleration is proclaimed for all Christians, and stipulations are made in favour of the Jews.

The Diet did not actually assemble before the 5th November 1816. Its first measures, and, above all, its first words, were not unpopular. The Holy Alliance, however, pressed with each succeeding month more heavily upon Germany, and got at last the control of the Confederation entirely into its hands. The chief epochs in this sad history were the Congress of Carlsbad, 1819,—the resolutions of which against the freedom of the press were pronounced by Gentz to be a victory more glorious than Leipzig; the ministerial conferences which immediately succeeded it at Vienna; and the adoption by the Diet of the final act (Schluss Act) of the Confederation on the 8th June 1820.

The following are the chief stipulations of the final act. The Confederation is indissoluble. No new member can be admitted without the unanimous consent of all the states, and no federal territory can be ceded to a foreign power without their permission. The regulations for the conduct of business by the Diet are amplified and more carefully defined. All quarrels between members of the Confederation are to be stopped before recourse is had to violence. The Diet may interfere to keep order in a state where the government of that state is notoriously incapable of doing so. Federal execution is provided for in case any government resists the authority of the Diet.

Other articles declare the right of the Confederation to make war and peace as a body, to guard the rights of each separate state from injury, to take into consideration the differences between its members and foreign nations, to mediate between

them, to maintain the neutrality of its territory, to make war when a state belonging to the Confederation is attacked in its non-federal territory, if the attack seems likely to endanger Germany. The constitutions of the respective states are made expressly as little inconvenient to the sovereigns as possible: "der Souverän kann durch eine landesständliche Verfassung nur in der Ausübung bestimmter Rechte an die Mitwirkung der Stände gebunden werden." The liberty of the press is restrained.

No very material event in the history of the Confederation took place between 1820 and 1834, when there were again ministerial conferences at Vienna, in consequence of the revolutionary agitation which had been called forth by the fall of the elder branch of the Bourbons. Frederick William IV. of Prussia, who succeeded in 1840, was really anxious for a change in the constitution of the Confederation, and many plans were agitated, but nothing came of them.

On the 1st January 1848, Prince Metternich assembled the diplomatists who were then in Vienna, and made, according to his usual custom, a statement with regard to the position of public affairs. With a sagacity truly worthy of himself and of the school of statesmen to which he belonged—a school unfortunately not yet extinct—he assured his listeners that never was Austria so tranquil, nor the peace of Europe more assured. Within three months he was on his way to the frontier, and Vienna and Berlin were in full revolt. The news of the Paris revolution worked not less powerfully in the valley of the Rhine than on the Danube and the Spree. Before the first symptoms of insubordination had been observed in either of the two great capitals, upon the 5th of March, fifty-one political writers, professors, and other persons of importance, had assembled in Heidelberg, and had summoned all who were or had been members of German constitutional assemblies to meet in Frankfort. Many responded to their call, and the body thus got together, which was called the Vorparlament, and the committee which succeeded it, devised the electoral law under which the assembly of the German people was presently convoked. The sovereigns neither did nor could attempt to resist the movement, and very soon the deputies of Austria, Prussia, and the minor states had gathered in the Paul's Kirche. On the 12th of July the Diet formally resigned its powers into the hands of the Reichsverweser, or Vicar of the Empire,—the popular Archduke John; and the laborious work of the diplomatists of 1814 and 1815 seemed to have finally disappeared. Already, however, there had risen in the minds of the Frankfort legislators the terrible question, What is this Germany for

which we are to devise a constitution? and very soon the assembly fell into two bitterly hostile sections. These were the since celebrated Klein-deutsch and Gross-deutsch parties. The first of these wished to exclude Austria from the Confederation, and to group the smaller states around Prussia. The second desired to retain in the Confederation all the German provinces of Austria, and to throw the hegemony into her hands. The former party was embraced by the most thoughtful and truly constitutional deputies, and was supported as a matter of course by the great bulk of the Prussian people. The latter was strong in southern Germany—strong in the support of the ultra-democrats, who saw in constitutionalism a most dangerous obstacle to their designs, and was aided by all the power and prestige of the Hapsburgs. The opponents were well matched. The struggle was long and doubtful, but in the end of 1848 the Klein-deutsch party prevailed. Heinrich von Gagern, the son of the man whose name we have mentioned in connexion with the first conferences about the Federal Act, succeeded M. Schmerling; and on March 28th, 1849, the crown of the resuscitated German Empire was decreed to Frederick William of Prussia. The feeble monarch after some hesitations declined it, making, as an English publicist of that day remarked, "il gran rifiuto" of our times. He wrote to Arndt, the author of the famous song "Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland?" in these characteristic words: "Is this offspring of the Revolution of 1848 really a crown? It has no cross on it. It does not mark on the brow of him who wears it the seal of the grace of God. It is the iron collar which would reduce to the position of a slave the descendant of twenty-four electors and kings, the chief of sixteen millions of men, and of the bravest and most devoted army in the world."

The refusal of Frederick William was a death-blow to the Frankfort Parliament. It lingered some time longer, but at last transferred itself to Stuttgart, where it was dispersed by the police,—a fate akin to that of the great river of the Fatherland; "which streams forth from the glaciers of the Achila, and ends in the sluices of Katwyk." The King of Prussia had not courage to play at the gold table, but he was unwilling to let the occasion pass by without winning, after the manner of his house, some little advantage. So profiting by the revolutions and fears of revolution which agitated Saxony and Hanover, he contrived to get the kings of these two countries to associate themselves with him in a triple alliance, round which were grouped twenty-four little states. Thus arose the much-talked-of league of the three kings, and the restricted confederation,—*engere Bundes-Staat*,—which was supported by the party called

"of Gotha," from the assembly held in that town in June 1849. So the summer went by.

On the 30th of September 1849, Austria and Prussia arranged for an *interim* management of the affairs of the Confederation in the room of the Reichsverweser, who was about to abdicate; and henceforward two Austrian and two Prussian plenipotentiaries sat at Frankfort.

The reaction, however, was growing ever stronger and stronger. In the month of August the surrender of the Hungarian army at Vilagos materially improved the position and prospects of Austria. No sooner had this occurred than Saxony and Hanover began to draw off from their close union with Prussia, and to gravitate towards her rival. They had associated themselves, they maintained, with their northern neighbour, not because they liked her projects for a reconstitution of Germany, but because they, equally with the dominant party in Prussia, cared above all things for the suppression of revolution in their respective territories. Prussia, however, unwilling to sacrifice the advantage which she had gained from the temporary weakness of Austria, insisted upon holding them to the alliance of the three kings and to the restricted confederation. Even in the spring of 1850, when she convoked the assembly of Erfurth, Prussia kept to this policy. A significant answer to the Prussian summons to Erfurth was given only a few days before the assembly met by the king of Wurtemberg, who made a speech in which he withstood the pretensions of Prussia from the point of view of the so-called league of the four kings,—Saxony, Bavaria, Hanover, and Wurtemberg,—who naturally enough inclined to the opinion of those who thought that the future constitution of Germany should be based upon a parliament, to which Austria, Prussia, and the united smaller states should each send a hundred members; and a directory of seven, in which Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, and Wurtemberg should each have a voice, while Electoral and Grand-ducal Hesse had each half a voice. The Prussian star was evidently not in the ascendant when General Radowitz, the *alter ego* of the king, and far the most remarkable figure which appeared during the "triangular duel" of revolution, reform, and conservatism, which makes up German history throughout the period of which we write, opened in the name of his sovereign the great council of the restricted confederation, the Assembly of Erfurth. The project of a reconstituted Germany, with a less democratic constitution than that which had been elaborated at Frankfort, which he laid before that assembly, was adopted in its entirety, after much discussion. Nothing more embarrassing to Prussia could have occurred; for even that pro-

ject was a great deal more democratic than what her rulers really wished for. The Duke of Coburg came to their assistance with a proposal for a congress of princes. The congress met, not in Gotha, but in Berlin, and was composed of the states most favourable to Prussia. The majority of these unfortunately were only of third and fourth rate importance, and neither it nor the college of plenipotentiaries from these various princes which followed it came to any great result. The game, however, now became more exciting. Austria replied by convoking the old Plenum at Frankfort; and before the autumn was out the kings of Bavaria and Wurtemberg had met Francis Joseph at Bregenz, and exchanged toasts and promises of the most warlike character. Where so many causes of estrangement existed, it was easy to find a pretext for quarrel. That pretext was furnished by the affairs of the most typically misgoverned of German countries, Electoral Hesse. We need not go into the details of the constitutional struggle in that ill-starred district: suffice it to say, that the Elector appealed to Frankfort and to Vienna; the people appealed to the restricted confederation and to Berlin. Troops marched from north and south. Shots were exchanged between the Austrian and the Prussian outposts; but Frederick William's heart failed him. Russia commanded: Radowitz was driven from power; Count Brandenburg died; and the convention of Olmutz put an end for the time to the dream of Prussian hegemony, and placed the foot of Schwarzenberg upon the neck of the liberal party.

Deep was the humiliation and bitter the wrath in Prussia; but on that we must not dwell. So elated with his victory was Prince Schwarzenberg, that at the Dresden conferences which presently assembled he had actually the assurance to propose that Austria should enter into the Germanic Confederation with all her non-Germanic provinces. Luckily France, England, and Russia came to the rescue. Baron Brenier, in a remarkable despatch, pointed out that this was altogether inadmissible, and perfectly opposed to the views of the three great non-Germanic powers who had guaranteed the order established in 1815. So Prussia had, after all, a sort of poor little triumph wherewith to console herself for the disgrace of Olmutz; and in less than three years after its disappearance back came the old Frankfort Diet again, with all its lumbering and unsatisfactory machinery, and German hopes and aspirations once more slumbered, if they did not sleep. What, then, is the constitution of this most unloved assembly? We have seen that the Confederation originally consisted of thirty-nine sovereign states: of these five have ceased to exist. Gotha has been divided between Coburg and Meiningen; Anhalt-Cöthen has merged in Anhalt-Dessau;

so, within the last few months, has Anhalt-Bernburg; while the two Hohenzollerns, Hechingen and Sigmaringen, have been ceded to Prussia. There are now, therefore, only thirty-four states included in the Germanic Confederation. These are: 1, Austria; 2, Prussia; 3, Bavaria; 4, Saxony; 5, Hanover; 6, Wurtemberg; 7, Baden; 8, Hesse-Cassel; 9, Hesse-Darmstadt; 10, Holstein and Lauenburg; 11, Luxemburg and Limburg; 12, Brunswick; 13, Mecklenburg-Schwerin; 14, Nassau, the four Saxon Duchies; 15, Weimar; 16, Meiningen; 17, Altenburg; 18, Coburg-Gotha; 19, Mecklenburg-Strelitz; 20, Oldenburg; 21, Anhalt; 22, Schwarzburg-Sonderhausen; 23, Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt; 24, Lichtenstein; 25, Waldeck; 26, Reuss-Greiz; 27, Reuss-Schleiz; 28, Schaumburg-Lippe; 29, Lippe-Detmold; 30, Hesse-Homburg; and the four free towns: 31, Lübeck; 32, Frankfort; 33, Bremen; and 34, Hamburg. Of these states, the 1st is ruled by an emperor; the 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, and 6th, by kings; the 7th, 9th, 11th, 13th, 15th, 19th, and 20th by grand-dukes; the 8th by an elector; the 10th, 12th, 14th, 16th, 17th, 18th, and 21st by dukes; from the 22d up to the 29th inclusive, the rulers are princes; the 30th is under the dominion of a landgrave; and the four others are free and self-governing communities.

The executive power of the Confederation and its legislative power, in so far as any such exists, are vested in the body which is popularly called the Diet (*Bundes-Versammlung*), so styled from *dies*, as meeting from day to day. That name, however, although accurately applied to the old assembly of the empire, has no such fitness when applied to the existing directory of the Confederation. This directory appears in two forms: 1, as a Plenum, or extraordinary convention; 2, as a committee (*engere Rath*, or *Conseil restreint*). In the former of these assemblies each of the thirty-four states has at least one vote, while Austria and the kingdoms have four; Baden, the two Hesses, Holstein and Lauenburg, Luxemburg and Limburg, each three; Brunswick, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and Nassau, each two. In the smaller assembly all the estates which have three or four voices in the larger have one, while all the rest have only fractions of a voice, being classed together for this purpose in "curie," or colleges; hence the distinction between virile and curial voices. The sixteenth college is composed of no less than seven small states; those, namely, which are marked above from 24 to 30 inclusive. As a general rule, all matters not specially withdrawn by the Federal and Final Acts from the control of the Engere Rath are decided by it, and by a simple majority. In the Plenum, on the other hand, a majority of two-thirds at least is always necessary. To the Plenum are

referred: 1, Questions about changes in fundamental laws; 2, Questions about changes in organic institutions; 3, Proposals as to the admission of new members; 4, Affairs of religion. No discussion takes place in the Plenum; but in the Engere Rath every subject may be fully discussed. When it is proposed to change a fundamental law, a unanimous vote must be first taken in the Plenum in favour of entertaining the question, after which the details are worked out in the Engere Rath. Decisions about the admission of a new member also require unanimity. It is obvious that in the larger assembly the influence of the smaller states is much greater than in the other.

Every thing which is within the purview of the Federal and Final Acts is within the competence of the Diet. For greater clearness we may give the following summary: 1. It watches over the international relations of Germany, the maintenance of internal peace, and of all the fundamental laws which regulate the existence of the Confederation. 2. It settles all quarrels between members of the Confederation, either by mediation or by a complicated judicial process, known as *un jugement austrégial*, "from *Austrag*, a decision" (a subject on which a perfect literature has been accumulated in half a century). 3. The settlement of disputes between sovereigns and their subjects, when all constitutional methods have failed. (We need hardly say that this power has been frequently abused.) 4. The duty of taking care that each state in the Confederation should have, in accordance with the Federal Act, a *Landesständliche Verfassung* was originally imposed upon the Diet, and it was also directed to provide that no constitution once given should be modified except by constitutional means. Further, it was directed to prevent any constitution being so worked as to make it impossible for the state in which it existed to fulfil its federal obligations. (Here was a field opened for infinite oppression, and under this head the action of the Diet has always been very unsatisfactory.) 5. The Diet watches over the rights of the mediatised princes and of private individuals who may have a *locus standi* to appeal to. 6. The Diet receives ambassadors, and has power of sending them if it pleases. 7. It regulates all things relative to the military force of the Confederation.

All the resolutions of the Diet which have an executive character, and are taken constitutionally, become at once valid for all purposes. Not so decisions which have a legislative character. These must be first approved by the respective chambers of the confederated states.

The Engere Rath meets every Thursday, but may adjourn for not more than four months after concluding its discussion on any subject. It has no power over its members, who

are only responsible to the governments which they represent. A decree of 8th March 1860 permitted the publication of its proceedings.

Eight committees—permanent or renewable—attend each to some specified department, and report to the Engere Rath on finance, general political affairs, commerce, military matters, the publication of its proceedings, upon the 14th article of the Federal Act, which relates to the affairs of the mediatised princes, upon cases which arise for federal execution, and upon petitions. The funds of the Confederation are under two different systems of management, according as they are applicable to mere routine matters, such as the support of the federal chancery, or to great enterprises, such as wars and enforcement of federal authority. The federal army consists of 503,072 men, of which Austria contributes 158,037, Prussia 133,769, and the small states all the rest. Five great fortresses—Landau, Luxemburg, Mayence, Radstadt, and Ulm—are garrisoned by federal troops.

Austria has the largest area in square miles protected by the Confederation and controlled by the Diet, but Prussia has the largest amount of population in the same position: Austria having 75,822 square miles to 71,698 of Prussia, and Prussia having 14,138,804 inhabitants to 12,802,944 of Austria, according to the census of 1861. More than twenty-two millions of Austrian subjects are not under the protection of the Confederation, which extends only to the archduchy of Austria, Bohemia, Styria, Tyrol, Moravia, and part of Illyria; whereas little more than four million Prussians are beyond its limits. 6,860,000 Austrians protected by the Confederation are not Germans, and 825,000 Prussians. Lichtenstein, with sixty-four square miles, is the smallest of the sovereign states, and Frankfort, with forty-three square miles of territory, is the least considerable in extent of the free cities; its population is, however, much larger than that of Lübeck, which rules over a district nearly three times as large.

The most unpopular of the German sovereigns are the King of Hanover and the Elector of Hesse; the most popular, the Grand-duke of Baden, the Grand-duke of Saxe-Weimar, the Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, the Duke of Brunswick, and perhaps the Grand-duke of Oldenburg. The aged King of Wurtemberg is said to have more political ability than any of his brother sovereigns. The King of Saxony has distinguished himself by a translation of the *Divina Commedia*, and his attainments as a jurist are very remarkable. The two Mecklenburgs, of which Mecklenburg-Schwerin is about five times larger than the other, although the title of their rulers is the

same, are probably on the whole the most backward states of the Confederation. There are no districts in which the life of Germany, as Germany was before the Napoleonic wars, could be better studied. Some few brief details about the small states included in the 15th and 16th *curie* may be read with interest, if only as making it easier to realise their existence as independent communities.

The Grand-duke of Oldenburg rules over three small patches of territory: Oldenburg proper, the principality of Lübeck, and Birkenfeld. The former lies between Hanover and Holland, and is a flat unlovely strip cut out of the great northern plain, very similar in character to the adjoining province of Friesland. The second is surrounded by Holstein, and the third lies in the hilly region along the Nahe, on the left bank of the Rhine. Oberstein, so famous for its agate-cutting, is the best-known spot in it. The Grand-duke is a man of high cultivation and good abilities. Up to 1848, his territories were under one of the least liberal governments in Germany; but the reverse is now the case. He is nearly connected with the imperial family of Russia, and has been accused of being too friendly to the European policy of his powerful relatives.

The dukedom of Anhalt-Dessau, which has now swallowed up its kindred dukedoms of Zerbst, Cöthen, and Bernburg, is remarkable chiefly for its fertility. The revolutionary shock of 1848 was felt here with unusual intensity, and the reaction was proportionably greater than in most parts of Germany. Hence the reigning house is very far from popular.

The two small principalities of Schwarzburg-Sonderhausen and Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt divide unequally between them the highland district called the "Upper County," amid the Thuringian hills, and the "Lower County," which lies considerably to the north of the other, within the edge of the great northern plain. The former contains 318 and the latter about 340 square miles.

Lichtenstein is situated on the left bank of the Rhine, between Switzerland and the Tyrol. Its capital is the little town of Vaduz, over which rises the old castle which is the "Stammhaus" of its princes. The ruler of Lichtenstein, although the last of sovereigns, now that Kniphausen is merged in Oldenburg, is one of the greatest of nobles, possessing estates in Austria thirty-four times larger than his principality. He draws no revenue from Lichtenstein, and the only grievance of which his subjects have recently complained is his absenteeism. Even this is now remedied, for he has agreed to spend a portion of every year at Vaduz.

Waldeck contains in all only 466 square miles, of which

thirty-two belong to Pymont, and the rest to Waldeck proper. The latter, a picturesque and hilly country, lies out of the path of tourists, and is very rarely visited, although not far from the town of Cassel, which is upon one of the great lines of communication. The well-known mineral springs, and the usual attractions of a watering-place, make Pymont, which is separated from Waldeck proper, and considerably to the north of it, much better known. The reigning prince, George Victor, was born in 1831, and came to the throne, after a long minority, in 1852.

The elder or Greiz branch of the ancient house of Reuss rules over a territory which is smaller than the county of Rutland; but the younger or Schleiz branch has succeeded to the possessions of the now extinct lines of Gera, Lobenstein, and Ebersdorf, and possesses a district more than three times as large as its rival. The scattered patches which belong to them lie partly in the Thuringian uplands, partly in the Erzgebirge and the richer lowlands of Saxony. The family custom of calling each succeeding head of the house by the name of Henry, and distinguishing him by some number between one and a hundred, is well known. The present sovereign of Reuss-Greiz is Henry XXII., and of Reuss-Schleiz, Henry LXVII.

The little principality of Lippe-Detmold lies close to Pymont, and is about the size of Waldeck. It contains 445 square miles, or, in other words, is about three times the size of the Isle of Wight. It is a rugged and much-wooded country, and is saved from insignificance by the fact that it witnessed that famous defeat of the Romans under Varrus which Arnold, perhaps not unjustly, considered to be one of the turning-points of history. A statue of Armenius, the Herrman of the Germans, has been erected at Detmold, the town which is the residence of the prince, whose territorial insignificance is not redeemed by any personal importance, and who has by no means always lived on the best of terms with his subjects. Extremely bad health has been pleaded as an excuse for his shortcomings.

Schaumburg-Lippe, which is close to the other, is not quite half so large, and in every way unimportant.

Hesse-Homburg is familiar, we hope not too well, to many of our readers. It contains only 106 square miles, but will ere long cease to be an independent state, and be merged in Hesse-Darmstadt.

Among the seventeen plenipotentiaries who form the ordinary council of the Bund, there are only two men of real eminence. These are the representatives of Baden and of Bavaria, Robert von Mohl and Ludwig von der Pfordten. The former is

one of that family of distinguished brothers amongst whom M. Jules Mohl, the professor of Persian at the Collège de France, is probable the best known in England. The other two, Hugo and Moritz, have made themselves famous, the one as a microscopic botanist, and the other as a very active member of the parliament of Wurtemberg. Robert von Mohl was born in 1799. He studied at Tübingen, and was afterwards professor of political science in that university. He was then for some time a member of the Chamber, but in 1847 was called as professor to Heidelberg. He took a conspicuous part in the proceedings of the Vorparlament, and was closely associated with the policy of Heinrich von Gagern through the eventful years of 1848 and 1849. He is a partisan of the Prussian or Klein-deutsch theory of German reconstruction. Very different are the views of his younger colleague, M. von der Pfordten, a name as generally—we do not say as justly—detested as that of Robert von Mohl is revered. He was born in 1811, educated at Erlangen and Heidelberg, became a *privat docent* in Würzburg, and later a professor of Roman law there. In 1841 he was sent as a judge to Aschaffenberg, and was later called again to be professor of Roman law; this time in Leipzig, where he made himself so popular as to be enabled to play a very considerable part in 1848, and to be for some time Saxon minister for foreign affairs. Thence he passed into the service of Bavaria, in which capacity his "particularist" and anti-Prussian tendencies became more and more developed. He was a strong advocate of the line of policy supported by the King of Wurtemberg in the memorable speech to which we have above alluded. Since that period he has become increasingly unpopular, and a few years ago the late King of Bavaria was obliged to sacrifice him to the hostility of the people, and to send him to Frankfort, instead of retaining him at the helm of affairs.

This article would be even more incomplete than the difficulty of compressing so large a subject into narrow limits renders almost necessary, if we were not to give a brief account of the various plans which have recently been suggested for the reconstruction of the Germanic Confederation. The present system has been condemned by all parties. Its extreme complication, the opportunities for obstruction which it affords, and the fact that as long as it exists Germany can never really take its place as a great power beside France and England, irritate beyond all bearing a people which, satisfied with its achievements in literature and science, is passionately desirous of political renown.

The years which immediately succeeded the revolutionary period of '48, '49, and '50, were marked in Germany rather by

the successful prosecution of industrial enterprises than by political combinations. The reaction had triumphed in Prussia, and it soon became clear that nothing could be done as long as Frederick William IV. dragged on his unhappy life. The commencement of the reign of his successor brought some glimmerings of hope, soon to be overcast; but, on the whole, at Frankfort things went on very much in the old way until the Italian war of 1859. No sooner had it broken out than all Germany went mad with fear of France, and the results were similar to those which were observed in 1813, 1840, and in 1848. A violent desire for German union became once more developed. In some parts of the country the people would have hailed with delight a declaration of war against France, and were quite ready to subscribe to the marvellous doctrine that the Mincio is the true frontier of Germany. In Bavaria more especially the warlike excitement was intense. In Prussia and the north, although there was a strong war-party, the passions of the nation were, so to speak, driven inward, and the result was the formation of the great society called the *Nationalverein*, which adopts the ideas which found favour at Frankfort and Gotha ten years before. To this same impulse from without was owing in a great measure the renewed activity of the democratic party at Berlin, which presently took the name of the *Deutsche-Fortschritt-Partei*, "signifying that it was at once zealous for internal reforms and for the settlement of the German question," for whose history and views we may refer to an article which appeared in this journal in January 1862. The most conspicuous names which are connected with the *Nationalverein* are those of politicians who belong to the *Fortschritt* section in the Prussian Chamber. We should perhaps make an exception in favour of one remarkable man, who seemed inclined for a time to cast in his lot with that section, and may very probably do so again. We allude, of course, to the brother of the late Prince Consort. The names of the twin duchies of Coburg and Gotha are more familiar to English readers than those of most of the small states of Germany, and will one day probably be even better known than they are now, as Prince Alfred is heir-apparent to both of them. The two together are but little larger than Worcestershire, and have a population of about 160,000; nevertheless, they are governed by separate chambers, which, however, combine for the transaction of common affairs every second year. The duke resides part of the year in each, but his establishment in Coburg is the more important of the two which he maintains. His relations to his subjects have not always been of the happiest, owing rather to the old-world notions of the ruled than to the shortcomings of the ruler. Few stranger political pamphlets

have appeared in recent years than that which, under the title of *Der Herzog von Coburg-Gotha und sein Volk*, was put forth in 1861 by Ernest II. Amongst all the minor princes of Germany, he is at this moment the most conspicuous figure; his character presents a striking contrast to that of his brother—the one is as impetuous as the other was prudent. He has been well described by one of his intimate friends as a Hussaren-Natur, and he is, in some sort, the leader of the liberal party in Germany. Within the last three years his politics have been Prussian, Austrian, and Middle-State; so that, thanks rather to circumstances than to any change of ultimate aim on his own part, he has boxed the compass of opinion upon the affairs of the Fatherland. His range of accomplishments and information is very great, and his position as head of that fortunate family which has arrived at such great destinies in Portugal, Belgium, and England, has mixed him up with the *grande politique* to a very great extent. His life, passed under the shadow of his ancestral fortress which rises over Coburg, or in his cheerful capital on the other side of the Thuringian range, varied by frequent journeys, and enlivened by a constant stream of society, is about as pleasant as the life of a potentate without real power can be; yet he obviously thirsts for a larger, if less dignified, sphere of action, and incarnates the vague longing for more real national life which is felt by the subjects of all the dukelets and princelets within the limits of the Confederation.

The most important official steps which have been taken for the reform of the Confederation since 1859 have been:

1. The proposals of the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, in 1860, for a personal interview of the sovereigns, with a view to arrange the establishment of a directory of three, in which one member elected by the smaller states should sit by the side of the representatives of Austria and Prussia (*trias idéé*).

2. The declaration of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha in 1861, made formally in the Diet, that if the monarchical principle was not to be sacrificed, German unity could only be brought about by an individual will, resting on a general representation of the German people.

3. The proposal of M. de Beust, the Saxon minister, in October and November 1861, the chief features of which were, the retention of the Engere Rath as it now stands, but with the proviso that it should sit one month in the year in North Germany, under the presidency of Prussia, and one month in the year in South Germany, under the presidency of Austria; that in the intervals the affairs of the Confederation should be managed by a directory of three, on the Meiningen plan; and that from time to time the Engere Rath should be assisted

by an assembly of 128 delegates selected from the several German parliaments.

4. The proposal of M. Bernstorff, in the name of Prussia, which had in view the creation of a smaller Prussian confederation within the great Confederation, of which Austria formed part.

5. The project brought before the assembled princes at Frankfort, in the month of August last year, by the great Kaiser himself. He proposed that Germany should henceforth be governed: 1. By an executive directory of five; that is, by Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, and two representatives elected by the minor states. 2. By a federal council, which was to consist of twenty-one representatives, and which was to have very considerable powers. 3. By a chamber composed of the princes, who were to have the right of accepting, rejecting, or modifying all the proposals which were brought before them. 4. A general assembly of 300, of whom 200 were to be elected by the lower and 100 by the upper houses of the respective states composing the Confederation. Austria was to send 75 members, Prussia 75, Bavaria 27, Hanover, Saxony, and Wurtemberg 15 each, and the smaller states from 1 to 12 each. The effect of this plan would have been to throw the preponderance into the scale of Austria, and to have formed the princes into a sort of league of mutual assurance against their subjects. Its warmest supporter was the King of Saxony.

The first of these projects was overthrown chiefly by the opposition of Bavaria, because it might well have happened that its sovereign should not have been the third member of the directory. The Duke of Coburg's proposal coincided with the desires of the great mass of the German people, but was eminently distasteful to most of the sovereigns, and was used by his enemies to give colour to the report that he aspired to be Emperor of Germany. The idea of Baron Beust was strongly opposed by Prussia and by Baden, while that of Count Bernstorff brought half the Confederation about his ears, and threatened another Olmutz. Prussia had her revenge most amply last year at Frankfort, putting, so to speak, a spoke in the wheel of her old enemy with eminent success. The upshot of the whole is, that the situation remains unchanged, and that the prospect of replacing the Staaten-Bund by a Bundes-Staat seems just as remote as ever.

Are we, therefore, to join in the cry which is at present so often heard, that Germany is incapable of reasonable political action? This would, we think, be most unjust. No political sagacity which has ever yet been exhibited in the world would be sufficient to bring order out of the chaos of German politics,

as long as the throne of Prussia is occupied by a weak or unworthy man. Cavour himself could have done nothing if his lot had been cast in Modena. The present King of Prussia, although personally respectable, is in point of intellect quite below par. Count Bismark makes no secret of his contempt for his royal master. "Never since the death of Frederick the Great," he recently observed, "has the king governed in Prussia; it is his entourage that governs." The military clique which surrounds the monarch, and which made the plan of military organisation too costly, with the distinct object of bringing about a collision between the king and the lower house, perpetually amuses him by little strategic problems. All last year the arrangements along the Polish frontier kept the lieutenant-king fully occupied;—Would it not be better to have twenty-five instead of fifteen men at such and such a bridge? or ten dragoons instead of four in such and such a hamlet? The Schleswig-Holstein war must be somewhat more exciting; and one of the principal reasons which has induced Count Bismark to plunge into it has been the desire to keep the king's mind fixed upon military matters, and to add to the prestige of the clique that surrounds him. If the Schleswig-Holstein crisis had arisen during the reign of an able and liberal king of Prussia, it is more than probable that some scheme analogous to that which would satisfy the *Deutsche-Fortschritt-Partei* might be now in the course of execution. Since, however, the quarrels began between the king and the parliament at Berlin the influence of Prussia has enormously decreased. The Duke of Coburg, who had stuck steadily to the Prussian schemes all through the revolutionary years '48, '49, and '50, favoured the Austrian plan last year; and every thing now points rather in the direction of a closer union between the middle states—leading, as it might, to the realisation of the "trias idea"—than to the fulfilment of Klein-deutsch aspirations. We are not inclined, however, to put much faith in the continuance of any such combination. We fear that if German unity cannot be effected through Prussia, it cannot be effected at all; for the Gross-deutsch scheme, however much it may appeal to the imagination, seems to us no better than a dream. When the Emperor Francis turned his back in 1806 upon Aix-la-Chapelle and Frankfort, he took an irrevocable step. Austria, as has been well said, at that eventful period elected, although she knew it not, to be henceforward Ost-reich, the empire of the east. The problem of German unity would be sufficiently difficult, if in order to solve it it were only necessary to compel the wavering wills of the people, and to break the obstinate wills of some of the sovereigns. Even for this a revolutionary period

is a necessary condition; yet moments there have been, and will be again, when it has seemed as if only a shake was wanted to make Germany, like water just about to freeze, coalesce into a mass. There are, however, other influences to be taken into consideration, and above all the opposition of France. It is perfectly natural that no French statesman of any political party should particularly approve the creation of a vast new power beyond the Rhine, more especially as that new power, although for the most part pacifically inclined, would be uncomfortably desirous to rectify its frontiers. If the Prussian idea were on the eve of execution, and nearly all Germany had consented to it, the opposition of the King of Hanover or the Elector of Hesse might at any moment bring the Zouaves across the Rhine, more especially as Russia would hardly view with disfavour any thing that tended to keep Germany weak. One thing, however, is certain, and that is, that German unity has no terrors for this country. We may not be very enthusiastic for it; we may feel to the full what Montalembert has so well insisted on—the superiority of small and happy little states, like Weimar, to a few centralised despotisms; we may acknowledge all that Particularismus has done, not only for Germany, but for mankind,—the vast intellectual treasures which have been accumulated in her universities, the works of genius which have been produced under the enlightened patronage of her too-much reviled princes;—still the Germans know what is best for themselves, and their hearts are set upon more real political life. The hopes of nations, like all strongest hopes, generally fulfil themselves; and it well may be that even in this generation the statesmen of England shall find firm allies in the Scandinavian, German, and Italian unions.

It is unfortunate that a natural sympathy for the weaker party has combined with much ignorance of the real merits of the question to create during the last few years in England a very strong feeling in favour of Denmark in her quarrel with Germany. We are confident that, as the question is more studied, an ever-increasing number of speakers in Parliament and writers in the newspapers will find themselves compelled, by the sheer force of facts, to express themselves in favour of the only settlement of the Schleswig-Holstein difficulty which is likely to be permanent—in favour, that is, of entirely separating from Denmark Holstein and the whole of the German part of Schleswig. We are far from denying that a great deal of absurdity has been mixed up with the contests of the rival languages and nationalities in the peninsula; but, after all, who have so good a right to go mad upon the question of nationalities as those very people of Ditmarsch, amongst

whom was bred the man who first originated the nationality mania—the illustrious, but not, as we venture to think, politically sagacious, Niebuhr? Of course, if we are to be guided by what the Germans call “Tendenz-politik,” and favour those views which we like best, we should prefer to gratify rather the advanced liberals of Denmark than the conservative and Lutheran bigots who lead society in the Duchies. Favour and affection cannot, however, alter legal right, much less enable one and a half millions to resist forty millions. Manifest destiny will have its way, in spite of our idle regrets. The Germans are at this moment extremely irritated against this country, and we cannot say that we are much surprised. Time and events, however, will bring us together again, and the animosity which has been engendered, here by the self-seeking violence of Bismark and Rechberg, there by the perverse fussiness of our Government and the ill-informed clamour of a portion of the public, will both vanish away.

ART. VIII.—STERNE AND THACKERAY.

The Life of Laurence Sterne. By Percy Fitzgerald, M.A., M.R.I.A.
In two volumes. Chapman and Hall.

Thackeray the Humourist and the Man of Letters. By Theodore Taylor, Esq. London: John Camden Hotten.

MR. PERCY FITZGERALD has expressed his surprise that no one before him has narrated the life of Sterne in two volumes. We are much more surprised that he has done so. The life of Sterne was of the very simplest sort. He was a Yorkshire clergyman, and lived for the most part a sentimental, questionable, jovial life in the country. He was a queer parson, according to our notions; but in those days there were many queer parsons. Late in life he wrote a book or two, which gave him access to London society; and then he led a still more questionable and unclerical life at the edge of the great world. After that he died in something like distress, and leaving his family in something like misery. A simpler life, as far as facts go, never was known; and simple as it is, the story has been well told by Sir Walter Scott, and has been well commented on by Mr. Thackeray. It should have occurred to Mr. Fitzgerald that a subject may only have been briefly treated because it is a limited and simple subject, which suggests but few remarks, and does not require an elaborate and copious description.

There are but few materials, too, for a long life of Sterne.

Mr. Fitzgerald has stuffed his volumes with needless facts about Sterne's distant relations, his great uncles and ninth cousins, in which no one now can take the least interest. Sterne's daughter, who was left ill-off, did indeed publish two little volumes of odd letters, which no clergyman's daughter would certainly have published now. But even these are too small in size and thin in matter to be spun into a copious narrative. We should in this Review have hardly given even a brief sketch of Sterne's life, if we did not think that his artistic character presented one fundamental resemblance and many superficial contrasts to that of a great man whom we have lately lost. We wish to point these out; and a few interspersed remarks on the life of Sterne will enable us to enliven the tedium of criticism with a little interest from human life.

Sterne's father was a shiftless roving Irish officer in the early part of the last century. He served in Marlborough's wars, and was cast adrift, like many greater people, by the caprice of Queen Anne and the sudden peace of Utrecht. Of him only one anecdote remains. He was, his son tells us, "a little smart man, somewhat rapid and hasty" in his temper; and during some fighting at Gibraltar he got into a squabble with another young officer, a Captain Phillips. The subject, it seems, was a goose; but that is not now material. It ended in a duel, which was fought with swords in a room. Captain Phillips pinned Ensign Sterne to a plaster-wall behind; upon which he quietly asked, or is said to have asked, "*Do wipe the plaster off your sword before you pull it out of me;*" which, if true, showed at least presence of mind. Mr. Fitzgerald, in his famine of matter, discusses who this Captain Phillips was; but into this we shall not follow him.

A smart, humorous, shiftless father of this sort is not perhaps a bad father for a novelist. Sterne was dragged here and there, through scenes of life where no correct and thriving parent would ever have taken him. Years afterwards, with all their harshness softened and half their pains dissembled, Sterne dashed them upon pages which will live for ever. Of money and respectability Sterne inherited from his father little or none; but he inherited two main elements of his intellectual capital—a great store of odd scenes, and the sensitive Irish nature which appreciates odd scenes.

Sterne was born in the year 1713, the year of the peace of Utrecht, which cast his father adrift upon the world. Of his mother we know nothing. Years afterwards, it was said that he behaved ill to her; at least neglected her in misery when he had the means of placing her in comfort. His enemies neatly said that he preferred "whining over a dead ass to relieving a

living mother." But these accusations have never been proved. Sterne was not remarkable for active benevolence, and certainly may have neglected an old and uninteresting woman, even though that woman was his mother; he was a bad hand at dull duties, and did not like elderly females; but we must not condemn him on simple probabilities, or upon a neat epigram and loose tradition. "The regiment," says Sterne, "in which my father served being broke, he left Ireland as soon as he was able to be carried, and came to the family seat at Elvington near York, where his mother lived." After this he was carried about for some years, as his father led the rambling life of a poor ensign, who was one of very many engaged during a very great war, and discarded at a hasty peace. Then, perhaps luckily, his father died, and "my cousin Sterne of Elvington," as he calls him, took charge of him, and sent him to school and college. At neither of these was he very eminent. He told one story late in life which may be true, but seems very unlike the usual school-life. "My schoolmaster," he says, "had the ceiling of the schoolroom new whitewashed: the ladder remained there. I one unlucky day mounted it, and wrote with a brush in large capitals LAU. STERNE, for which the usher severely punished me. My master was much hurt at this, and said before me that never should that name be effaced, for I was a boy of genius, and he was sure I should come to preferment." But "genius" is rarely popular in places of education; and it is, to say the least, remarkable that so sentimental a man as Sterne should have chanced upon so sentimental an instructor. It is wise to be suspicious of aged reminiscents; they are like persons entrusted with "untold gold:" there is no check on what they tell us.

Sterne went to Cambridge, and though he did not acquire elaborate learning, he thoroughly learned a gentlemanly stock of elementary knowledge. There is even something scholarlike about his style. It bears the indefinable traces which an exact study of words will always leave upon the use of words. He was accused of stealing learning, and it is likely enough that a great many needless quotations which were stuck into *Tristram Shandy* were abstracted from secondhand storehouses where such things are to be found. But what he stole was worth very little, and his theft may now at least be pardoned, for it injures the popularity of his works. Our present novel-readers do not at all care for an elaborate caricature of the scholastic learning; it is so obsolete that we do not care to have it mimicked. Much of *Tristram Shandy* is a sort of antediluvian fun, in which uncouth Saurian jokes play idly in an unintelligible world.

When he left college, Sterne had a piece of good fortune which in fact ruined him. He had an uncle with much influence in the church, and he was thereby seduced to enter the church. There could not have been a greater error. He had no special vice; he was notorious for no wild dissipation or unpardonable folly; he had done nothing which even in this more discreet age would be considered imprudent. He had even a refinement which must save him from gross vice, and a nicety of nature which must save him from coarse associations. But for all that he was as little fit for a Christian priest as if he had been a drunkard and a profligate. Perhaps even he was less fit.

There are certain persons whom taste guides, much as morality and conscience guide ordinary persons. They are "gentlemen." They revolt from what is coarse; are sickened by that which is gross; hate what is ugly. They have no temptation to what we may call ordinary vices; they have no inclination for such raw food; on the contrary, they are repelled by it, and loathe it. The law in their members does *not* war against the law of their mind; on the contrary, the *taste* of their bodily nature is mainly in harmony with what conscience would prescribe or religion direct. They may not have heard the saying that the "beautiful is higher than the good, for it includes the good." But when they do hear it, it comes upon them as a revelation of their instinctive creed, of the guidance under which they have been living all their lives. They are pure because it is ugly to be impure; innocent because it is out of taste to be otherwise; they live within the hedge-rows of polished society; they do not wish to go beyond them into the great deep of human life; they have a horror of that "impious ocean," yet not of the impiety, but of the miscellaneous noise, the disordered confusion of the whole. These are the men whom it is hardest to make Christian,—for the simplest reason: paganism is sufficient for them. Their pride of the eye is a good pride; their love of the flesh is a delicate and directing love. They keep "within the pathways" because they dislike the gross, the uncultured, and the untrod. Thus they reject the primitive precept which comes before Christianity. Repent! repent! says a voice in the wilderness; but the delicate pagan feels superior to the voice in the wilderness. Why should he attend to this uncouth person? He has nice clothes and well-chosen food, the treasures of exact knowledge, the delicate results of the highest civilisation. Is he to be directed by a person of savage habits, with a distorted countenance, who lives on wild honey, who does not wear decent clothes? To the pure worshiper of beauty, to the naturally refined pagan, conscience and the religion of conscience are not merely intruders, but barbarous intruders. At least so it is in

youth, when life is simple and temptations if strong are distinct. Years afterwards, probably, the purest pagan will be taught by a constant accession of indistinct temptations, and by a gradual declension of his nature, that taste at the best, and sentiment of the very purest, are insufficient guides in the perplexing labyrinth of the world.

Sterne was a pagan. He went into the Church; but Mr. Thackeray, no bad judge, said most justly that his sermons "have not a single Christian sentiment." They are well-expressed, vigorous, moral essays; but they are no more. Much more was not expected by many congregations in the last age. The secular feeling of the English people, though always strong,—though strong in Chaucer's time, and though strong now,—was never so all-powerful as in the last century. It was in those days that the poet Crabbe was remonstrated with for introducing heaven and hell into his sermons; such extravagances, he was told, were very well for the Methodists, but a *clergyman* should confine himself to sober matters of this world, and show the prudence and the reasonableness of virtue during this life. There is not much of heaven and hell in Sterne's sermons, and what there is seems a rhetorical emphasis which is not essential to the argument, and which might perhaps as well be left out. Auguste Comte might have admitted most of these sermons; they are healthy statements of earthly truths, but they would be just as true if there was no religion at all. Religion helps the argument, because foolish people might be perplexed with this world, and they yield readily to another; religion enables you—such is the real doctrine of these divines, when you examine it—to coax and persuade those whom you cannot rationally convince; but it does not alter the matter in hand—it does not affect that of which you wish to persuade men, for you are but inculcating a course of conduct *in this life*. Sterne's sermons would be just as true if the secularists should succeed in their argument, and the "valuable illusion" of a deity were omitted from the belief of mankind.

However, in fact, Sterne took orders, and by the aid of his uncle, who was a church politician, and who knew the powers that were, he obtained several small livings. Being a pluralist was a trifle in those easy times; nobody then thought that the parishioners of a parson had a right to his daily presence; if some provision were made for the performance of a Sunday service, he had done his duty, and he could spend the surplus income where he liked. He might perhaps be bound to reside, if health permitted, on one of his livings, but the law allowed him to have many, and he could not be compelled to reside on them all. Sterne preached well-written sermons on Sundays,

and led an easy pagan life on other days, and no one blamed him.

He fell in love too, and after he was dead, his daughter found two or three of his love-letters to her mother, which she rashly published. They have been the unfeeling sport of persons not in love up to the present time. Years ago Mr. Thackeray used to make audiences laugh till they cried by reading one or two of them, and contrasting them with certain other letters also about his wife, but written many years later. This is the sort of thing :

"Yes! I will steal from the world, and not a babbling tongue shall tell where I am—Echo shall not so much as whisper my hiding-place—suffer thy imagination to paint it as a little sun-gilt cottage, on the side of a romantic hill—dost thou think I will leave love and friendship behind me? No! they shall be my companions in solitude, for they will sit down and rise up with me in the amiable form of my L.—We will be as merry and as innocent as our first parents in Paradise, before the arch fiend entered that undescribable scene.

"The kindest affections will have room to shoot and expand in our retirement, and produce such fruit as madness, and envy, and ambition have always killed in the bud.—Let the human tempest and hurricane rage at a distance, the desolation is beyond the horizon of peace. My L. has seen a polyanthus blow in December—some friendly wall has sheltered it from the biting wind.—No planetary influence shall reach us, but that which presides and cherishes the sweetest flowers.—God preserve us! how delightful this prospect in idea! We will build, and we will plant, in our own way—simplicity shall not be tortured by art—we will learn of nature how to live—she shall be our alchymist, to mingle all the good of life into one salubrious draught.—The gloomy family of care and distrust shall be banished from our dwelling, guarded by thy kind and tutelar deity—we will sing our choral songs of gratitude, and rejoice to the end of our pilgrimage.

"Adieu, my L. Return to one who languishes for thy society.
L. STERNE."

The beautiful language with which young ladies were wooed a century ago is a characteristic of that extinct age; at least, we fear that no such beautiful English will be discovered when our secret repositories are ransacked. The age of ridicule has come in, and the age of good words has gone out.

There is no reason to doubt, however, that Sterne was really in love with Mrs. Sterne. People have doubted it because of these beautiful words; but, in fact, Sterne was just the sort of

man to be subject to this kind of feeling. He took—and to this he owes his fame—the *sensitive* view of life. He regarded it not from the point of view of intellect, or conscience, or religion, but in the plain way in which natural feeling impresses, and will always impress, a natural person. He is a great author; certainly not because of great thoughts, for there is scarcely a sentence in his writings which can be called a thought; nor from sublime conceptions which enlarge the limits of our imagination, for he never leaves the sensuous,—but because of his wonderful sympathy with, and wonderful power of representing, simple human nature. The best passages in Sterne are those which every one knows, like this:

“Thou hast left this matter short, said my uncle Toby to the corporal, as he was putting him to bed,—and I will tell thee in what, Trim.—In the first place, when thou madest an offer of my services to Le Fever,—as sickness and travelling are both expensive, and thou knowest he was but a poor lieutenant, with a son to subsist as well as himself, out of his pay,—that thou didst not make an offer to him of my purse; because, had he stood in need, thou knowest, Trim, he had been as welcome to it as myself.—Your honour knows, said the corporal, I had no orders;—True, quoth my uncle Toby,—thou didst very right, Trim, as a soldier,—but certainly very wrong as a man.

“In the second place, for which, indeed, thou hast the same excuse, continued my uncle Toby,—when thou offeredst him whatever was in my house,—thou shouldst have offered him my house too:—A sick brother officer should have the best quarters, Trim, and if we had him with us,—we could tend and look to him:—Thou art an excellent nurse thyself, Trim,—and what with thy care of him, and the old woman’s, and his boy’s, and mine together, we might recruit him again at once, and set him upon his legs.—

“—In a fortnight or three weeks, added my uncle Toby, smiling,—he might march.—He will never march, an’ please your honour, in this world, said the corporal:—He will march, said my uncle Toby, rising up from the side of the bed, with one shoe off:—An’ please your honour, said the corporal, he will never march, but to his grave:—He shall march, cried my uncle Toby, marching the foot which had a shoe on, though without advancing an inch,—he shall march to his regiment.—He cannot stand it, said the corporal;—He shall be supported, said my uncle Toby;—He’ll drop at last, said the corporal, and what will become of his boy?—He shall not drop, said my uncle Toby, firmly.—A-well-o’day,—do what we can for

him, said Trim, maintaining his point,—the poor soul will die : —He shall not die, by G—, cried my uncle Toby.

“—The ACCUSING SPIRIT, which flew up to heaven’s chancery with the oath, blush’d as he gave it in;—and the RECORDING ANGEL, as he wrote it down, dropp’d a tear upon the word, and blotted it out for ever.

“—My uncle Toby went to his bureau,—put his purse into his breeches pocket, and having ordered the corporal to go early in the morning for a physician,—he went to bed, and fell asleep.

“The sun looked bright the morning after, to every eye in the village but Le Fever’s and his afflicted son’s; the hand of death press’d heavy upon his eye-lids,—and hardly could the wheel at the cistern turn round its circle,—when my uncle Toby, who had rose up an hour before his wonted time, entered the lieutenant’s room, and without preface or apology, sat himself down upon the chair by the bed-side, and independently of all modes and customs, opened the curtain in the manner an old friend and brother officer would have done it, and asked him how he did,—how he had rested in the night,—what was his complaint,—where was his pain,—and what he could do to help him :—and without giving him time to answer any one of the enquiries, went on and told him of the little plan which he had been concerting with the corporal the night before for him.—

“—You shall go home directly, Le Fever, said my uncle Toby, to my house,—and we’ll send for a doctor to see what’s the matter,—and we’ll have an apothecary,—and the corporal shall be your nurse ;—and I’ll be your servant, Le Fever.

“There was a frankness in my uncle Toby,—not the *effect* of familiarity,—but the *cause* of it,—which let you at once into his soul, and shewed you the goodness of his nature ; to this, there was something in his looks, and voice, and manner, super-added, which eternally beckoned to the unfortunate to come and take shelter under him ; so that before my uncle Toby had half finished the kind offers he was making to the father, had the son insensibly pressed up close to his knees, and had taken hold of the breast of his coat, and was pulling it towards him. —The blood and spirits of Le Fever, which were waxing cold and slow within him, and were retreating to their last citadel, the heart,—rallied back,—the film forsook his eyes for a moment,—he looked up wishfully in my uncle Toby’s face,—then cast a look upon his boy,—and that *ligament*, fine as it was, —was never broken. —

“Nature instantly ebb’d again,—the film returned to its place,—the pulse fluttered—stopp’d—went on—throbb’d—stopp’d again—moved—stopp’d—shall I go on ?—No.”

In one of the "Roundabout Papers" Mr. Thackeray introduces a literary man complaining of his "sensibility." "Ah," he replies, "my good friend, your sensibility is your livelihood: if you did not feel the events and occurrences of life more acutely than others, you could not describe them better; and it is the excellence of your description by which you live." This is precisely true of Sterne. He is a great author because he felt acutely. He is the most pathetic of writers because he had—when writing, at least—the most pity. He was, too, we believe, pretty sharply in love with Mrs. Sterne, because he was sensitive to that sort of feeling likewise.

The difficulty of this sort of character is the difficulty of keeping it. It does not last. There is a certain bloom of sensibility and feeling about it which, in the course of nature, is apt to fade soon, and which, when it has faded, there is nothing to replace. A character with the binding elements—with a firm will, a masculine understanding, and a persistent conscience—may retain, and perhaps improve, the early and original freshness. But a loose-set though pure character the moment it is thrown into temptation sacrifices its purity, loses its gloss, and gets, so to speak, out of form entirely.

We do not know with great accuracy what Sterne's temptations were, but there was one, which we can trace with some degree of precision, which has left inefaceable traces on his works,—which probably left some traces upon his character and conduct. There was in that part of Yorkshire a certain John Hall Stevenson, a country gentleman of some fortune, and possessed of a castle, which he called Crazy Castle. Thence he wrote tales, which he named "Crazy Tales," but which certainly are not entitled to any such innocent name. The license of that age was unquestionably wonderful. A man of good property could write any evil. There was no legal check, or ecclesiastical check, and hardly any check of public opinion. These "Crazy Tales" have license without humour, and vice without amusement. They are the writing of a man with some wit, but only enough wit for light conversation, which becomes overworked and dull when it is reduced to regular composition and made to write long tales. The author, feeling his wit jaded, perpetually becomes immoral, in the vain hope that he will cease to be dull. He has attained his reward; he will be remembered for nauseous tiresomeness by all who have read him.

But though the "Crazy Tales" are now tedious, Crazy Castle was a pleasant place, at least to men like Sterne. He was an idle young parson, with much sensibility, much love of life and variety, and not a bit of grave goodness. The dull duties of a

country parson, as we now understand them, would never have been to his taste; and the sinecure idleness then permitted to parsons left him open to every temptation. The frail texture of merely natural purity, the soft fibre of the instinctive pagan, yield to the first casualty. Exactly what sort of life they led at Crazy Castle we do not know, but vaguely we do know, and we may be sure *Mrs. Sterne* was against it.

One part of *Crazy Castle* has had effects which will last as long as English literature. It had a library richly stored in old folio learning, and also in the amatory reading of other days. Every page of *Tristram Shandy* bears traces of both elements. Sterne, when he wrote it, had filled his head and his mind, not with the literature of his own age, but with the literature of past ages. He was thinking of Rabelais rather than of Fielding; of forgotten romances rather than of Richardson. He wrote, indeed, of his own times and of men he had seen, because his sensitive vivid nature would only endure to write of present things. But the *mode* in which he wrote was largely coloured by literary habits and literary fashions that had long passed away. The oddity of the book was a kind of advertisement to its genius, and that oddity consisted in the use of old manners upon new things.—No analysis or account of *Tristram Shandy* could be given which would suit the present generation; being, indeed, a book without plan or order, it is in every generation unfit for analysis. This age would not endure a statement of the most telling points, as the writer thought them, and no age would like an elaborate plan of a book in which there is no plan, in which the detached remarks and separate scenes were really meant to be the whole. The notion that "a plot was to hang plums upon" was Sterne's notion exactly.

The real excellence of Sterne is single and simple; the defects are numberless and complicated. He excels, perhaps, all other writers in mere simple description of common sensitive human action. He places before you in their simplest form the elemental facts of human life; he does not view them through the intellect, he scarcely views them through the imagination; he does but reflect the unimpaired impression which the facts of life, which does not change from age to age, make on the deep basis of human feeling, which changes as little though years go on. The example we quoted just now is as good as any other, though not better than any other. Our readers should go back to it again, or our praise may seem overcharged. It is the portrait-painting of the heart. It is as pure a reflection of mere natural feeling as literature has ever given, or will ever give. The delineation is nearly perfect. Sterne's feeling in his higher moments so much overpowered his intellect, and so di-

rected his imagination, that no intrusive thought blemishes, no distorting fancy mars, the perfection of the representation. The disenchanting facts which deface, the low circumstances which debase the simpler feelings oftener than any other feelings, his art excludes. The feeling which would probably be coarse in the reality is refined in the picture. The unconscious tact of the nice artist heightens and chastens reality, but yet it is reality still. His mind was like a pure lake of delicate water: it reflects the ordinary landscape, the rugged hills, the loose pebbles, the knotted and the distorted firs perfectly and as they are, yet with a charm and fascination that they have not in themselves. This is the highest attainment of art, to be at the same time nature and something more than nature.

But here the great excellence of Sterne ends as well as begins. In *Tristram Shandy* especially there are several defects which, while we are reading it, tease and disgust so much that we are scarcely willing even to admire as we ought to admire the nice pictures of human emotion. The first of these, and perhaps the worst, is the fantastic disorder of the form. It is an imperative law of the writing-art that a book should go straight on. A great writer should be able to tell a great meaning as coherently as a small writer tells a small meaning. The magnitude of the thought to be conveyed, the delicacy of the emotion to be painted, render the introductory touches of consummate art not of less importance, but of more importance. A great writer should train the mind of the reader for his greatest things; that is, by first strokes and fitting preliminaries he should form and prepare his mind for the due appreciation and the perfect enjoyment of high creations. He should not blunder upon a beauty, nor, after a great imaginative creation, should he at once fall back to bare prose. The high-wrought feeling which a poet excites should not be turned out at once and without warning into the discomposing world. It is one of the greatest merits of the greatest living writer of fiction,—of the authoress of *Adam Bede*,—that she never brings you to any thing without preparing you for it; she has no loose lumps of beauty; she puts in nothing at random; after her greatest scenes, too, a natural sequence of subordinate realities again tones down the mind to this sublunary world. Her logical style—the most logical, probably, which a woman ever wrote—aids in this matter her natural sense of due proportion. There is not a space of incoherency—not a gap. It is not natural to begin with the point of a story, and she does not begin with it. When some great marvel has been told, we all wish to know what came of it, and she tells us. Her natural way, as it seems to those who do not know its rarity, of telling what happened

produces the consummate effect of gradual enchantment and as gradual disenchantment. But Sterne's style is *unnatural*. He never begins at the beginning and goes straight through to the end. He shies in a beauty suddenly; and just when you are affected he turns round and grins at it. "Ah," he says, "is it not fine?" And then he makes jokes which at that place and that time are out of place, or passes away into scholastic or other irrelevant matter, which simply disgusts and disheartens those whom he has just delighted. People excuse all this irregularity of form by saying that it was imitated from Rabelais. But this is nonsense. Rabelais, perhaps, could not in his day venture to tell his meaning straight out; at any rate, he did not tell it. Sterne should not have chosen a model so monstrous. Incoherency is not less a defect because an imperfect foreign writer once made use of it. "You may have, sir, a reason," said Dr. Johnson, "for saying that two and two make five, but they will still make four." Just so a writer may have a reason for selecting the defect of incoherency, but it is a defect still. Sterne's best things read best out of his books,—in Enfield's *Speaker* and other places,—and you can say no worse of any one as a continuous artist.

Another most palpable defect—especially palpable nowadays—in *Tristram Shandy* is its indecency. It is quite true that the customary conventions of writing are much altered during the last century, and much which would formerly have been deemed blameless would now be censured and disliked. The audience has changed; and decency is of course in part dependent on who is within hearing. A divorce case may be talked over across a club-table with a plainness of speech and development of expression which would be indecent in a mixed party, and scandalous before young ladies. Now, a large part of old novels may very fairly be called club-books; they speak out plainly and simply the notorious facts of the world, as men speak of them to men. Much excellent and proper masculine conversation is wholly unfit for repetition to young girls; and just in the same way books written,—as was almost all old literature, for men only, or nearly only,—seem coarse enough when contrasted with novels written by young ladies upon the subjects and in the tone of the drawing-room. The change is inevitable; as soon as works of fiction are addressed to boys and girls, they must be fit for boys and girls; they must deal with a life which is real so far as it goes, but which is yet most limited; which deals with the most passionate part of life, and yet omits the errors of the passions; which aims at describing men in their relations to women, and yet omits an all but universal influence which more or less distorts and modifies all these relations.

As we have said, the change cannot be helped. A young ladies' literature must be a limited and truncated literature. The indiscriminate study of human life is not desirable for them, either in fiction or in reality. But the habitual formation of a scheme of thought and a code of morality upon incomplete materials is a very serious evil. The readers for whose sake the omissions are made cannot fancy what is left out. Many a girl of the present day reads novels, and nothing but novels; she forms her mind by them, as far as she forms it by reading at all; even if she reads a few dull books, she soon forgets all about them, and remembers the novels only; she is more influenced by them than by sermons. They form her idea of the world, they define her taste, and modify her morality; not so much in explicit thought and direct act as unconsciously and in her floating fancy. How is it possible to convince such a girl, especially if she is clever, that on most points she is all wrong? She has been reading most excellent descriptions of mere society; she comprehends those descriptions perfectly, for her own experience elucidates and confirms them. She has a vivid picture of a *patch* of life. Even if she admits in words that there is something beyond, something of which she has no idea, she will not admit it really and in practice. What she has mastered and realised will incurably and inevitably overpower the unknown something of which she knows nothing, can imagine nothing, and can make nothing. "I am not sure," said an old lady, "but I think it's the novels that make my girls so heady." It is the novels. A very intelligent acquaintance with limited life makes them think that the world is far simpler than it is, that men are easy to understand, "that mamma is so foolish."

The novels of the last age have certainly not this fault. They do not err on the side of reticence. A girl may learn from them more than it is desirable for her to know. But, as we have explained, they were meant for men and not for girls; and if *Tristram Shandy* had simply given a plain exposition of necessary facts—necessary, that is, to the development of the writer's view of the world, and to the telling of the story in hand,—we should not have complained; we should have regarded it as the natural product of a now extinct society. But there are most unmistakable traces of "Crazy Castle" in *Tristram Shandy*. There is indecency for indecency's sake. It is made a sort of recurring and even permeating joke to mention things which are not generally mentioned. Sterne himself made a sort of defence, or rather denial, of this. He once asked a lady if she had read *Tristram*. "I have not, Mr. Sterne," was the answer; "and, to be plain with you, I am informed it is

not proper for female perusal." "My dear good lady," said Sterne, "do not be gulled by such stories; the book is like your young heir there" (pointing to a child of three years old who was rolling on the carpet in white tunics): "he shows at times a good deal that is usually concealed, but it is all in perfect innocence." But a perusal of *Tristram* would not make good the plea. The unusual publicity of what is ordinarily imperceptible is not the thoughtless accident of amusing play; it is deliberately sought after as a nice joke; it is treated as a good in itself.

The indecency of *Tristram Shandy*—at least of the early part, which was written before Sterne had been to France—is especially an offence against taste, because of its ugliness. *Moral* indecency is always disgusting. There certainly is a sort of writing which cannot be called decent, and which describes a society to the core immoral, which nevertheless is no offence against art; it violates a higher code than that of taste, but it does not violate the code of taste. The *Mémoires de Grammont*—hundreds of French memoirs about France—are of this kind more or less. They describe the refined, witty, elegant immorality of an idle aristocracy. They describe a life "unsuitable to such a being as man in such a world as the present one," in which there are no high aims, no severe duties, where some precepts of morals seem not so much to be sometimes broken as to be generally suspended and forgotten; such a life, in short, as God has never suffered men to lead on this earth long, which He has always crushed out by calamity and revolution. This life, though an offence in morals, was not an offence in taste. It was an elegant, a *pretty* thing while it lasted. Especially in enhancing description, where the alloy of life may be omitted, where nothing vulgar need be noticed, where every thing elegant may be neatly painted,—such a world is elegant enough. Morals and policy must decide how far such delineations are permissible or expedient; but the art of beauty,—but criticism has no objection to them. They are pretty paintings of pretty objects, and that is all it has to say. They may very easily do harm; if generally read among the young of the middle class, they would be sure to do harm: they would teach not a few to aim at a sort of refinement denied them by circumstances, and to neglect the duties allotted them; it would make shopmen "bad imitations of polished ungodliness," and also bad shopmen. But still, though it would in such places be noxious literature, in itself it would be pretty literature. The critic must praise it, though the moralist must condemn it, and perhaps the politician forbid it.

But *Tristram's* indecency is the very opposite to this refined

sort. It consists in allusions to certain inseparable accompaniments of actual life which are not beautiful, which can never be made interesting, which would, *if* they were decent, be dull and uninteresting. There is, it appears, a certain excitement in putting such matters into a book: there is a minor exhilaration even in petty crime. At first such things look so odd in print that you go on reading them to see what they look like; but you soon give up. What is disenchanting or even disgusting in reality does not become enchanting or endurable in delineation. You are more angry at it in literature than in life; there is much which is barbarous and animal in reality that we could wish away; we endure it because we cannot help it, because we did not make it and cannot alter it, because it is an inseparable part of this inexplicable world. But why we should put this coarse alloy, this dross of life, into the *optional* world of literature, which we can make as we please, it is impossible to say. The needless introduction of accessory ugliness is always a sin in art, and is not at all less so when such ugliness is disgusting and improper. *Tristram Shandy* is incurably tainted with a pervading vice; it dwells at length on, it seeks after, it returns to, it gloats over, the most unattractive part of the world.

There is another defect in *Tristram Shandy* which would of itself remove it from the list of first-rate books, even if those which we have mentioned did not do so. It contains eccentric characters only. Some part of this defect may be perhaps explained by one peculiarity of its origin. Sterne was so sensitive to the picturesque parts of life, that he wished to paint the picturesque parts of the people he hated. Country-towns in those days abounded in odd characters. They were out of the way of the great opinion of the world, and shaped themselves to little opinions of their own. They regarded the customs which the place had inherited as the customs which were proper for it, and which it would be foolish, if not wicked, to try to change. This gave English country-life a motley picturesqueness then, which it wants now, when London ideas shoot out every morning, and carry on the wings of the railway a uniform creed to each cranny of the kingdom, north and south, east and west. These little public opinions of little places wanted, too, the crushing power of the great public opinion of our own day; at the worst, a man could escape from them into some different place which had customs and doctrines that suited him better. We now may fly into another "city," but it is all the same Roman empire; the same uniform justice, the one code of heavy laws press us down and make us—the sensible part of us at least—as like other people as we can make ourselves. The public opinion of county-towns yielded soon to individual exceptions; it had

not the confidence in itself which the opinion of each place now receives from the accordant and simultaneous echo of a hundred places. If a man chose to be queer, he was bullied for a year or two, then it was settled that he was "queer;" that was fact to him, and must be accepted. In a year or so he became an "institution" of the place, and the local pride would have been grieved if he had amended the oddity which suggested their legends and added a flavour to their life. Of course, if a man was rich and influential, he might soon disregard the mere opinion of the petty locality. Every place has wonderful traditions of old rich men who did exactly as they pleased, because they could set at naught the opinions of the neighbours, by whom they were feared, and who did not, as now, dread the unanimous conscience which does not fear even a squire of 2000*l.* a year, or a banker of 800*l.*, because it is backed by the wealth of London and the magnitude of all the country. There is little oddity in county-towns now; they are detached scraps of great places; but in Sterne's time there was much, and he used it unsparingly.

Much of the delineation is of the highest merit. Sterne knew how to describe eccentricity, for he showed its relation to our common human nature: he showed how we were related to it, how in some sort and in some circumstances we might ourselves become it. He reduced the abnormal formation to the normal rules. Except upon this condition, eccentricity is no fit subject for literary art. Every one must have known characters which, if they were put down in books, barely and as he sees them, would seem monstrous and disproportioned,—which would disgust all readers,—which every critic would term unnatural. While characters are monstrous, they should be kept out of books; they are ugly unintelligibilities, foreign to the realm of true art. But as soon as they can be explained to us, as soon as they are shown in their union with, in their outgrowth from common human nature, they are the best subjects for great art—for they are new subjects. They teach us, not the old lesson which our fathers knew, but a new lesson which will please us and make us better than them. Hamlet is an eccentric character, one of the most eccentric in literature; but, because by the art of the poet, we are made to understand that he is a possible, a *vividly* possible man, he enlarges our conceptions of human nature; he takes us out of the bounds of commonplace. He "instructs us by means of delight." Sterne does this too. Mr. Shandy, Uncle Toby, Corporal Trim, Mrs. Shandy,—for in strictness she too is eccentric from her abnormal commonplaceness,—are beings of which the possibility is brought home to us, which we feel we could under circumstances and by in-

fluences become, which, though contorted and twisted, are yet spun out of the same elementary nature, the same thread as we are. Considering how odd these characters are, the success of Sterne is marvellous, and his art in this respect consummate. But yet on a point most nearly allied it is very faulty. Though each individual character is shaded off into human nature, the whole is not shaded off into the world. This society of originals and oddities is left to stand by itself, as if it were a natural and ordinary society,—a society easily conceivable and needing no explanation. Such is not the manner of the great masters; in their best works a constant atmosphere of half commonplace personages surrounds and shades off, illustrates and explains every central group of singular persons.

On the whole, therefore, the judgment of criticism on *Tristram Shandy* is concise and easy. It is immortal because of certain scenes suggested by Sterne's curious experience, detected by his singular sensibility, and heightened by his delineative and discriminative imagination. It is defective because its style is fantastic, its method illogical and provoking; because its indecency is of the worst sort, as far as in such matters an artistic judgment can speak of worst and best; because its world of characters forms an incongruous group, of singular persons utterly dissimilar to and irreconcilable with the world in which we live. It is a great work of art, but of barbarous art. Its mirth is boisterous. It is *provincial*. It is redolent of an inferior society; of those who think crude animal spirits in themselves delightful, who do not know that, without wit to point them or humour to convey them, they are disagreeable to others; who like disturbing transitions, blank pages, and tricks of style; who do not know that a simple and logical form of expression is the most effective, if not the easiest,—the least laborious to readers, if not always the most easily attained by writers.

The oddity of *Tristram Shandy* was, however, a great aid to its immediate popularity. If an author were to stand on his head now and then in Cheapside, his eccentricity would bring him into contact with the police, but it would advertise his writings; they would sell better: people would like to see what was said by a great author who was so odd as to stand so. Sterne put his eccentricity into his writings, and therefore came into collision with the critics; but he attained the same end. His book sold capitally. As with all popular authors, he went to London; he was fêted. "The man Sterne," growled Dr. Johnson, "has dinner engagements for three months." The upper world,—ever desirous of novelty, ever tired of itself, ever anxious to be amused,—was in hopes of a new wit. It naturally

hoped that the author of *Tristram* would talk well, and it sent for him to talk.

He did talk well, it appears, though not always very correctly, and never very clerically. His appearance was curious, but yet refined. Eager eyes, a wild look, a long lean frame, and what he called a cadaverous bale of goods for a body, made up an odd exterior, which attracted notice, and did not repel liking. He looked like a scarecrow with bright eyes. With a random manner, but not without a nice calculation, he discharged witticisms at London parties. His keen nerves told him which were fit witticisms; *they* took, and *he* was applauded.

He published some sermons too. That tolerant age liked, it is instructive as well as amusing to think, sermons by the author of *Tristram Shandy*. People wonder at the rise of Methodism; but ought they to wonder? If a clergyman publishes his sermons *because* he has written an indecent novel—a novel which is purely pagan—which is outside the ideas of Christianity, whose author can scarcely have been inside of them,—if a man so made and so circumstanced is *as such* to publish Christian sermons, surely Christianity is a joke and a dream. Wesley was right in this at least; if Christianity be true, the upper life of the last century was based on rotten falsehood. A world which is really secular—which professes to be Christian, is the worst of worlds.

The only point in which Sterne resembles a clergyman of our own time is, that he lost his voice. That peculiar affection of the chest and throat, which is hardly known among barristers, but which inflicts such suffering upon parsons, attacked him also. Sterne too, as might be expected, went abroad for it. He “spluttered French,” he tells us, with success in Paris; the accuracy of the grammar some phrases in his letters would lead us to doubt; but few, very few Yorkshire parsons could then talk French at all, and there was doubtless a fine tact and sensibility in what he said. A literary phenomenon wishing to enjoy society, and able to amuse society, has ever been welcome in the Parisian world. After Paris, Sterne went to the south of France, and on to Italy, lounging easily in pretty places, and living comfortably, as far as one can see, upon the profits of *Tristram Shandy*. Literary success has seldom changed more suddenly and completely the course of a man's life. For years Sterne resided in a country parsonage, and the sources of his highest excitement were a country-town full of provincial oddities, and a “Crazy Castle” full of the license and the whims of a country squire. On a sudden London, Paris, and Italy were opened to him. From a few familiar things he was suddenly transferred to many unfamiliar things. He was equal to them, though the

change came so suddenly in middle life,—though the change from a secluded English district to the great and interesting scenes was far greater, far fuller of unexpected sights and unforeseen phenomena, than it can be now,—when travelling is common,—when the newspaper is “abroad,”—when every one has in his head some feeble image of Europe and the world. Sterne showed the delicate docility which belongs to a sensitive and experiencing nature. He understood and enjoyed very much of this new and strange life, if not the whole.

The proof of this remains written in the *Sentimental Journey*. There is no better painting of first and easy impressions than that book. After all which has been written on the *ancien régime*, an Englishman at least will feel a fresh instruction on reading these simple observations. They are instructive *because* of their simplicity. The old world at heart was not like that; there were depths and realities, latent forces and concealed results, which were hidden from Sterne's eye, which it would have been quite out of his way to think of or observe. But the old world *seemed* like that. This was the spectacle of it as it was seen by an observing stranger; and we take it up, not to know what was the truth, but to know what we should have thought to be the truth if we had lived in those times. People say *Eöthen* is not like the real East; very likely it is not, but it is like what an imaginative young Englishman would *think* the East. Just so the *Sentimental Journey* is not the true France of the old monarchy, but it is exactly what an observant quick-eyed Englishman might fancy that France to be. This has given it popularity; this still makes it a valuable relic of the past. It is not true to the outward nature of real life, but it is true to the reflected image of that life in an imaginative and sensitive man.

Here is the actual description of the old chivalry of France; the “cheap defence of nations,” as Mr. Burke called it a little while afterwards.

“When states and empires have their periods of declension, and feel in their turns what distress and poverty is—I stop not to tell the causes which gradually brought the house d'E—— in Brittany into decay. The Marquis d'E—— had fought up against his condition with great firmness; wishing to preserve, and still show to the world, some little fragments of what his ancestors had been—their indiscretions had put it out of his power. There was enough left for the little exigencies of *obscurity*.—But he had two boys who look'd up to him for *light*—he thought they deserved it. He had tried his sword—it could not open the way—the *mounting* was too expensive—and simple economy was not a match for it—there was no resource but commerce.

In any other province in France, save Brittany, this was smiting the root for ever of the little tree his pride and affection wish'd to see reblossom. But in Brittany, there being a provision for this, he avail'd himself of it; and taking an occasion when the states were assembled at Rennes, the Marquis, attended with his two boys, entered the court; and having pleaded the right of an ancient law of the duchy, which, though seldom claim'd, he said, was no less in force, he took his sword from his side—Here, said he, take it; and be trusty guardians of it, till better times put me in condition to reclaim it.

The president accepted the Marquis's sword—he staid a few minutes to see it deposited in the archives of his house—and departed.

The Marquis and his whole family embarked the next day for Martinico, and in about nineteen or twenty years of successful application to business, with some unlook'd-for bequests from distant branches of his house, return'd home to reclaim his nobility and to support it.

It was an incident of good fortune which will never happen to any traveller but a sentimental one, that I should be at Rennes at the very time of this solemn requisition: I call it solemn—it was so to me—

The Marquis enter'd the court with his whole family: he supported his lady—his eldest son supported his sister, and his youngest was at the other extreme of the line next his mother—he put his handkerchief to his face twice—

—There was a dead silence. When the Marquis had approach'd within six paces of the tribunal, he gave the Marchioness to his youngest son, and advancing three steps before his family—he reclaim'd his sword. His sword was given him; and the moment he got it into his hand he drew it almost out of the scabbard—'twas the shining face of a friend he had once given up—he look'd attentively along it, beginning at the hilt, as if to see whether it was the same—when observing a little rust which it had contracted near the point, he brought it near his eye, and bending his head down over it—I think I saw a tear fall upon the place: I could not be deceived by what followed.

'I shall find,' said he, 'some other way to get it off.'

When the Marquis had said this, he return'd his sword into its scabbard, made a bow to the guardians of it—and with his wife and daughter, and his two sons following him, walk'd out.

O how I envied him his feelings!

It shows a touching innocence of the imagination to believe,—for probably Sterne did believe,—or to expect his readers to believe, in a *noblesse* at once so honourable and so theatrical.

In two points the *Sentimental Journey*, viewed with the critic's eye and as a mere work of art, is a great improvement upon *Tristram Shandy*. The style is simpler and better; it is far more connected; it does not jump about, or leave a topic *because* it is interesting; it does not worry the reader with fantastic transitions, with childish contrivances and rhetorical intricacies.

Highly elaborate the style certainly is, and in a certain sense artificial; it is full of nice touches, which must have come only upon reflexion,—a careful polish and judicious enhancement, in which the critic sees many a trace of time and toil. But a style delicately adjusted and exquisitely polished belongs to such a subject. Sterne undertook to write, *not* of the coarse business of life,—very strong common sort of words are best for that,—*not* even of interesting outward realities, which may be best described in a nice and simple style; but of the passing moods of human nature, of the impressions which a sensitive nature receives from the world without; and it is only the nicest art and the most dexterous care which can fit an obtuse language to such fine employment. How language was first invented and made we may not know; but beyond doubt it was shaped and fashioned into its present state by common ordinary men and women using it for common and ordinary purposes. They wanted a carving-knife, not a razor or lancet. And those great artists who have to use language for more exquisite purposes, who employ it to describe changing sentiments and momentary fancies and the fluctuating and indefinite inner world, must use curious nicety and hidden but effectual artifice, else they cannot duly punctuate their thoughts and slice the fine edges of their reflexions. A hair's-breadth is as important to them as a yard's-breadth to a common workman. Sterne's style has been criticised as artificial; but it is justly and rightly artificial, because language used in its natural and common mode was not framed to delineate, cannot delineate, the delicate subjects with which he occupies himself.

That contact with the world, and with the French world especially, should teach Sterne to abandon the arbitrary and fantastic structure of *Tristram Shandy* is most natural. French prose may be unreasonable in its meaning, but is ever rational in its structure; it is logic itself. It will not endure that the reader's mind should be jarred by rough transitions, or distracted by irrelevant oddities. *Antics* in style are prohibited by its severe code, just as eccentricities in manner are kept down by the critical tone of a fastidious society. In a barbarous country oddity may be attractive; in the great world it never is, except for a moment; it is on trial to see whether it is really oddity, to see if it does not contain elements which may be useful to, which may be naturalised in society at large. But inherent eccentricity, oddity *pur et simple*, is *immiscible* in the great ocean of universal thought; it is apart from it, even when it floats in and is contained in it; very, very soon it is cast out from the busy waters, and left alone upon the beach. Sterne had the sense to be taught by the sharp touch of the world; he threw

aside the "player's garb" which he had been tempted to assume. He discarded too, as was equally natural, the ugly indecency of *Tristram Shandy*. We will not undertake to defend the morality of certain scenes in the *Sentimental Journey*; there are several which might easily do much harm; but there is nothing displeasing to the natural man in them. They are nice enough; to those whose æsthetic nature has not been laid waste by their moral nature they are attractive. They have a dangerous prettiness, which may easily incite to practical evil; but in itself, and separated from its censurable consequences, such prettiness is an artistic perfection. It was natural that the aristocratic world should easily teach Sterne that separation between the laws of beauty and the laws of morality which has been familiar to it during many ages—which makes so much of its essence.

Mrs. Sterne did not prosper all this time. She went abroad and stayed at Montpellier with her husband; but it is not wonderful that a mere "wife," taken out of Yorkshire, should be unfit for the great world. The domestic appendices of men who rise much hardly ever suit the high places at which they arrive. Mrs. Sterne was no exception. She seems to have been sensible, but it was *domestic* sense. It was of the small world, small: it was fit to regulate the Yorkshire parsonage, it was suitable to a small *ménage* even at Montpellier. But there was a deficiency in general mind. She did not, we apprehend, comprehend or appreciate the new thoughts and feelings which a new and great experience had awakened in her husband's mind. His mind moved, but hers could not; she was anchored, but he was at sea.

To fastidious writers who will only use very dignified words, there is much difficulty in describing Sterne's life in his celebrity. But to humbler persons, who can only describe the things of society in the words of society, the case is simple. Sterne was "an old flirt." These are short and expressive words, and they tell the whole truth. There is no good reason to suspect his morals, but he dawdled about pretty women. He talked at fifty with the admiring tone of twenty; pretended to "freshness" of feeling; though he had become mature, did not put away immature things. That he had any real influence over women is very unlikely; he was a celebrity, and they liked to exhibit him; he was amusing, and they liked him to amuse them. But they doubtless felt that he too was himself a joke. Women much respect real virtue; they much admire strong and successful immorality; but they neither admire nor respect the timid age which affects the forms of vice without its substance; which preserves the exterior of youth, though the reality is departed; which is insidious but not dangerous, sentimental but

not passionate. Of this sort was Sterne, and he had his reward. Women of the world are willing to accept any admiration, but this sort they accept with suppressed and latent sarcasm. They ridiculed his imbecility while they accepted his attentions and enjoyed his society.

Many men have lived this life with but minor penalties, and justly; for though perhaps a feeble and contemptible, it is not a bad or immoral life. But Sterne has suffered a very severe though a delayed and posthumous penalty. He was foolish enough to write letters to some of his friends, and after his death, to get money, his family published them. This is the sort of thing:

"Eliza will receive my books with this. The sermons came all hot from the heart: I wish that I could give them any title to be offered to yours.—The others came from the head—I am more indifferent about their reception.

"I know not how it comes about, but I am half in love with you—I ought to be wholly so; for I never valued (or saw more good qualities to value) or thought more of one of your sex than of you; so adieu.

"Yours faithfully,

"if not affectionately,

"L. STERNE."

"I cannot rest, Eliza, though I shall call on you at half-past twelve, till I know how you do.—May thy dear face smile, as thou risest, like the sun of this morning. I was much grieved to hear of your alarming indisposition yesterday; and disappointed too, at not being let in. Remember, my dear, that a friend has the same right as a physician. The etiquettes of this town (you'll say) say otherwise.—No matter! Delicacy and propriety do not always consist in observing their frigid doctrines.

"I am going out to breakfast, but shall be at my lodgings by eleven, when I hope to read a single line under thy own hand, that thou art better, and wilt be glad to see thy Bramin."

This Eliza was a Mrs. Draper, the wife of a judge in India, "much respected in that part of the world." We know little of Eliza, except that there is a stone in Bristol cathedral

SACRED
TO THE MEMORY
OF

MRS. ELIZABETH DRAPER,
IN WHOM
GENIUS AND BENEVOLENCE
WERE UNITED.

She died August 3, 1778, aged 35.

Let us hope she possessed, in addition to genius and benevolence, the good sense to laugh at Sterne's letters.

In truth, much of the gloss and delicacy of Sterne's pagan instinct had faded away by this time. He still retained his fine sensibility, his exquisite power of entering into and of delineating plain human nature. But the world had produced its inevitable effect on that soft and voluptuous disposition. It is not, as we have said, that he was guilty of grave offences or misdeeds; he made what he would have called a "splutter of vice," but he would seem to have committed very little. Yet, as with most minds which have exempted themselves from rigid principle, there was a diffused texture of general laxity. The fibre had become imperfect; the moral constitution was impaired; the high colour of rottenness had come at last out, and replaced the delicate bloom and softness of the early fruit. There is no need to write commonplace sermons on an ancient text. The beauty and charm of natural paganism will not endure the stress and destruction of this rough and complicated world. An instinctive purity will preserve men for a brief time, but hardly through a long and varied life of threescore and ten years.

Sterne, however, did not live so long. In 1768 he came to London for the last time, and enjoyed himself much. He dined with literary friends and supped with fast friends. He liked both. But the end was at hand. His chest had long been delicate; he got a bad cold which became a pleurisy, and died in a London lodging—a footman sent by "some gentlemen who were dining," and a hired nurse, being the only persons present. His family were away; and he had devoted himself to intellectual and luxurious enjoyments, which are at least as sure to make a lonely deathbed as a refined and cultivated life. "Self-scanned, self-centred, and self-secure," a man may perhaps live, but even so *by himself* he will be sure to die. For self-absorbed men the world at large cares little; as soon as they cease to amuse, or to be useful, it flings them aside, and they die alone. Even Sterne's grave, they say, was so obscure and neglected that the corpse-stealers ventured to open it, and his body was dissected without being recognised. The life of literary men is often a kind of sermon in itself; for the pursuit of fame, when it is contrasted with the grave realities of life, seems more absurd and trifling than most pursuits, and to leave less behind it. Mere *amusers* are never respected. It would be harsh to call Sterne a mere amuser, he is much more; but so the contemporary world regarded him. They laughed at his jests, disregarded his deathbed, and neglected his grave.

What, it may be asked, is there in such a career, or such a character as this, to remind us of the great writer whom we

have just lost? In externals there seems little resemblance, or rather there seems to be great contrast. On the one side a respected manhood, a long industry, an honoured memory; on the other hand a life lax, if not dissolute, little labour, and a dishonoured grave. Mr. Thackeray, too, has written a most severe criticism on Sterne's character. Can we, then, venture to compare the two? We do so venture; and we allege, and that in spite of many superficial differences, there was one fundamental and ineradicable resemblance between the two.

Thackeray, like Sterne, looked at every thing—at nature, at life, at art—from a *sensitive* aspect. His mind was, to some considerable extent, like a woman's mind. It could comprehend abstractions when they were unrolled and explained before it, but it never naturally created them; never of itself, and without external obligation, devoted itself to them. The visible scene of life—the streets, the servants, the clubs, the gossip, the West End—fastened on his brain. These were to him reality. They burnt in upon his brain; they pained his nerves; their influence reached him through many avenues, which ordinary men do not feel much, or to which they are altogether impervious. He had distinct and rather painful sensations where most men have but confused and blurred ones. Most men have felt the *instructive* headache, during which they are more acutely conscious than usual of all which goes on around them,—during which every thing seems to pain them, and in which they understand it, because it pains them, and they cannot get their imagination away from it. Thackeray had a nerve-ache of this sort always. He acutely felt every possible passing fact—every trivial interlude in society. Hazlitt used to say of himself, and used to say truly, that he could not enjoy the society in a drawing-room for thinking of the opinion which the footman formed of his odd appearance as he went upstairs. Thackeray had too healthy and stable a nature to be thrown so wholly off his balance; but the footman's view of life was never out of his head. The obvious facts which suggest it to the footman poured it in upon him; he could not exempt himself from them. As most men say that the earth *may* go round the sun, but in fact, when we look at the sun, we cannot help believing it goes round the earth,—just so this most impressible, susceptible genius could not help half accepting, half believing the common ordinary sensitive view of life, although he perfectly knew in his inner mind and deeper nature that this apparent and superficial view of life was misleading, inadequate, and deceptive. He could not help seeing every thing, and what he saw made so near and keen an impression upon him, that he could not again exclude it from his understanding; it stayed there, and disturbed his thoughts.

If, he often says, "people could write about that of which they are really thinking, how interesting books would be!" More than most writers of fiction he felt the difficulty of abstracting his thoughts and imagination from near facts which *would* make themselves felt. The sick wife in the next room, the unpaid baker's bill, the lodging-house keeper who doubts your solvency; these, and such as these,—the usual accompaniments of an early literary life,—are constantly alluded to in his writings. Perhaps he could never take a grand enough view of literature, or accept the truth of "high art," because of his natural tendency to this stern and humble realism. He knew that he was writing a tale which would appear in a green magazine (with others) on the 1st of March, and would be paid for perhaps on the 11th, by which time, probably, "Mr. Smith" would have to "make up a sum," and would again present his little account. There are many minds besides his who feel an interest in these realities, though they yawn over "high art" and elaborate judgments.

A painfulness certainly clings like an atmosphere round Mr. Thackeray's writings, in consequence of his inseparable and ever-present realism. We hardly know where it is, yet we are all conscious of it less or more. A free and bold writer, Sir Walter Scott throws himself far away into fictitious worlds, and soars there without effort, without pain, and with unceasing enjoyment. You see as it were between the lines of Mr. Thackeray's writing, that his thoughts were never long away from the close proximate scene. His writings might be better if it had been otherwise; but they would have been less peculiar, less individual; they would have wanted their character, their flavour, if he had been able while writing them to forget for many moments the ever-attending, the ever-painful sense of himself.

Hence have arisen most of the censures upon him, both as he seemed to be in society and as he was in his writings. He was certainly uneasy in the common and general world, and it was natural that he should be so. The world poured in upon him, and *inflicted* upon his delicate sensibility a number of petty pains and impressions which others do not feel at all, or which they feel but very indistinctly. As he sat he seemed to read off the passing thoughts—the base, common, ordinary impressions—of every one else. Could such a man be at ease? Could even a quick intellect be asked to set in order with such velocity so many data? Could any temper, however excellent, be asked to bear the contemporaneous influx of innumerable minute annoyances? Men of ordinary nerves, who feel a little of the pains of society, who perceive what really passes, who are not

absorbed in the petty pleasures of sociability, could well observe how keen was Thackeray's *sensation* of common events, could easily understand how difficult it must have been for him to keep mind and temper undisturbed by a miscellaneous tide at once so incessant and so forcible.

He could not emancipate himself from such impressions even in a case where most men hardly feel them. Many people have—it is not difficult to have—some vague sensitive perception of what is passing in the minds of the guests, of the ideas of such as sit at meat; but who remembers that there are also nervous apprehensions, also a latent mental life among those who “stand and wait”—among the floating figures which pass and carve? But there was no impression to which Mr. Thackeray was more constantly alive, or which he was more apt in his writings to express. He observes:

“Between me and those fellow-creatures of mine who are sitting in the room below, how strange and wonderful is the partition! We meet at every hour of the daylight, and are indebted to each other for a hundred offices of duty and comfort of life; and we live together for years, and don't know each other. John's voice to me is quite different from John's voice when it addresses his mates below. If I met Hannah in the street with a bonnet on, I doubt whether I should know her. And all these good people, with whom I may live for years and years, have cares, interests, dear friends and relatives, mayhap schemes, passions, longing hopes, tragedies of their own, from which a carpet and a few planks and beams utterly separate me. When we were at the sea-side, and poor Ellen used to look so pale, and run after the postman's bell, and seize a letter in a great scrawling hand, and read it, and cry in a corner, how should we know that the poor little thing's heart was breaking? She fetched the water, and she smoothed the ribbons, and she laid out the dresses, and brought the early cup of tea in the morning, just as if she had had no cares to keep her awake. Henry (who lived out of the house) was the servant of a friend of mine who lived in chambers. There was a dinner one day, and Henry waited all through the dinner. The champagne was properly iced, the dinner was excellently served; every guest was attended to; the dinner disappeared; the dessert was set; the claret was in perfect order, carefully decanted, and more ready. And then Henry said, ‘If you please, sir, may I go home?’ He had received word that his house was on fire; and, having seen through his dinner, he wished to go and look after his children, and little sticks of furniture. Why, such a man's livery is a uniform of honour. The crest on his button is a badge of bravery.”

Nothing in itself could be more admirable than this instinctive sympathy with humble persons; not many things are rarer than this nervous apprehension of what humble persons think. Nevertheless it cannot, we think, be effectually denied that it

coloured Mr. Thackeray's writings and the more superficial part of his character—that part which was most obvious in common and current society—with very considerable defects. The pervading idea of the “Snob Papers” is too frequent, too recurring, too often insisted on, even in his highest writings; there was a slight shade of similar feeling even in his occasional society, and though it was certainly unworthy of him, it was exceedingly natural that it should be so, with such a mind as his and in a society such as ours.

There are three methods in which a society may be constituted. There is the equal system, which, with more or less of variation, prevails in France and in the United States. The social presumption in these countries always is that every one is on a level with every one else. In America, the porter at the station, the shopman at the counter, the boots at the hotel, when neither a Negro nor an Irishman, is your equal. In France *égalité* is a political first principle. The whole of Louis Napoleon's *régime* depends upon it: remove that feeling, and the whole fabric of the Empire will pass away. We once heard a great French statesman illustrate this. He was giving a dinner to the clergy of his neighbourhood, and was observing that he had now no longer the power to help or hurt them, when an eager *curé* said, with simple-minded joy, “Oui, monsieur, maintenant personne ne peut rien, ni le comte, ni le prolétaire.” The democratic priest so rejoiced at the universal levelling which had passed over his nation, that he could not help boasting of it when silence would have been much better manners. We are not now able—we have no room and no inclination—to discuss the advantages of democratic society; but we think in England we may venture to assume that it is neither the best nor the highest form which a society can adopt, and that it is certainly fatal to that development of individual originality and greatness by which the past progress of the human race has been achieved, and from which alone, it would seem, all future progress is to be anticipated. If it be said that people are all alike, that the world is a plain with no natural valleys and no natural hills, the picturesqueness of existence is destroyed, and, what is worse, the instinctive emulation by which the dweller in the valley is stimulated to climb the hill is annihilated and becomes impossible.

On the other hand, there is the opposite system, which prevails in the East,—the system of irremovable inequalities, of hedged-in castes which no one can enter but by birth, and from which no born member can issue forth. This system likewise, in this age and country, needs no attack, for it has no defenders. Every one is ready to admit that it cramps originality, by de-

fining our work irrespective of our qualities and before we were born; that it retards progress, by restraining the wholesome competition between class and class, and the wholesome migration from class to class, which are the best and strongest instruments of social improvement.

And if both these systems be condemned as undesirable and prejudicial, there is no third system except that which we have,—the system of *removable inequalities*, where many people are inferior to and worse off than others, but in which each may in *theory* hope to be on a level with the highest below the throne, and in which each may reasonably, and without sanguine impracticability, hope to gain one step in social elevation, to be at last on a level with those who at first were just above them. But, from the mere description of such a society, it is evident that, taking man as he is, with the faults which we know he has, and the tendencies which he invariably displays, some poison of “snobbishness” is inevitable. Let us define it as the habit of “pretending to be higher in the social scale than you really are.” Every body will admit that such pretension is a fault and a vice, yet every observant man of the world would also admit that, considering what other misdemeanours men commit, this offence is not inconceivably heinous, and that, if people never did any thing worse, they might be let off with a far less punitive judgment than in the actual state of human conduct would be just or conceivable. How are we to hope men will pass their lives in putting their best foot foremost, and yet will never boast that their better foot is farther advanced and more perfect than in fact it is? Is boasting to be made a capital crime? Given social ambition as a propensity of human nature; given a state of society like ours, in which there are prizes which every man may seek, degradations which every one may erase, inequalities which every one may remove,—it is idle to suppose that there will not be all sorts of striving to cease to be last and to begin to be first, and it is equally idle to imagine that all such strivings will be of the highest kind. This effort will be, like all the efforts of our mixed and imperfect human nature, partly good and partly bad, with much that is excellent and beneficial in it, and much also which is debasing and pernicious. The bad striving after unpossessed distinction is snobbishness, which from the mere definition cannot be defended, but which may be excused as a natural frailty in an emulous man who is not distinguished, who hopes to be distinguished, and who perceives that a valuable means of gaining distinction is a judicious though false pretension that it has already been obtained.

Mr. Thackeray, as we think, committed two errors in this matter. He lacerates “snobs” in his books as if they had com-

mitted an unpardonable outrage and inexpressible crime. That man, he says, is anxious "to know lords; and he pretends to know more of lords than he really does know. What a villain! what a disgrace to our common nature! what an irreparable reproach to human reason!" Not at all; it is a fault which satirists should laugh at, and which moralists condemn and disapprove, but which yet does not destroy the whole vital excellence of him who possesses it,—which may leave him a good citizen, a pleasant husband, a warm friend; "a fellow," as the undergraduate said, "*up in his morals.*"

In transient society it is possible, we think, that Mr. Thackeray thought too much of social inequalities. They belonged to that common, plain, perceptible world which filled his mind, and which left him at times, and at casual moments, no room for a purely intellectual and just estimate of men as they really are in themselves and apart from social perfection or defects. He could gauge a man's reality as well as any observer, and far better than most: his attainments were great, his perception of men instinctive, his knowledge of casual matters enormous; but he had a greater difficulty than other men in relying only upon his own judgment. "What the footman—what Mr. Yellowplush Jeames would think and say," could not but occur to his mind, and would modify, not his settled judgment, but his transient and casual opinion of the poet or philosopher. By the constitution of his mind he thought much of social distinctions, and yet he was in his writings too severe on those who, in cruder and baser ways, showed that they also were thinking much.

Those who perceive that this irritable sensibility was the basis of Thackeray's artistic character, that it gave him his materials, his implanted knowledge of things and men, and gave him also that keen and precise style which hit in description the nice edges of all objects,—those who trace these great qualities back to their real source in a somewhat painful organisation, must have been vexed or amused, according to their temperament, at the common criticism which associates him with Fielding. Fielding's essence was the very reverse; it was a bold spirit of bounding happiness. No just observer could talk to Mr. Thackeray, or look at him, without seeing that he had deeply felt many sorrows,—perhaps that he was a man *likely* to feel sorrows,—that he was of an anxious temperament. Fielding was a reckless enjoyer. He saw the world,—wealth and glory, the best dinner and the worst dinner, the gilded *salon* and the low sponging-house,—and he saw that they were good. Down every line of his characteristic writings there runs this elemental energy of keen delight. There is no trace of such a thing in

Thackeray. A musing fancifulness is far more characteristic of him than a joyful energy.

Sterne had all this sensibility also, but—and this is the cardinal discrepancy—it did not make him irritable. He was not hurried away, like Fielding, by buoyant delight; he stayed and mused on painful scenes. But they did not make him angry. He was not irritated at the “foolish fat scullion.” He did not vex himself because of the vulgar. He did not amass petty details to prove that tenth-rate people were ever striving to be ninth-rate people. He had no tendency to rub the bloom off life. He accepted pretty-looking things, even the French aristocracy, and he owes his immortality to his making them prettier than they are. Thackeray was pained by things, and exaggerated their imperfections; Sterne brooded over things with joy or sorrow, and he idealised their sentiment—their pathetic or joyful characteristics. This is why the old lady said, “Mr. Thackeray was an uncomfortable writer,”—and an uncomfortable writer he is.

Nor had Sterne a trace of Mr. Thackeray’s peculiar and characteristic scepticism. He accepted simply the pains and pleasures, the sorrows and the joys of the world; he was not perplexed by them, nor did he seek to explain them, or account for them. There is a tinge—a mitigated but perceptible tinge—of Swift’s philosophy in Thackeray. “Why is all this? Surely this is very strange? Am I right in sympathising with such stupid feelings, such petty sensations? Why are these things? Am I not a fool to care about or think of them? The world is dark, and the great curtain hides from us all.” This is not a steady or an habitual feeling, but it is never quite absent for many pages. It was inevitable, perhaps, that, in a sceptical and inquisitive age like this, some vestiges of puzzle and perplexity should pass into the writings of our great sentimentalist. He would not have fairly represented the moods of his time if he omitted that pervading one.

We had a little more to say of these great men, but our limits are exhausted, and we must pause. Of Thackeray it is too early to speak at length. A certain distance is needful for a just criticism. The present generation have learned too much from him to be able to judge him rightly. We do not know the merit of those great pictures which have sunk into our minds, and which have coloured our thoughts, which are become habitual memories. In the books we know best, as in the people we know best, small points, sometimes minor merits, sometimes small faults, have an undue prominence. When the young critics of this year have gray hairs, their children will tell them what is the judgment of posterity upon Mr. Thackeray.

ART. IX.—EARLY HISTORY OF MESSIANIC IDEAS.

Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henoch Entstehung und Zusammensetzung. Von H. Ewald. Göttingen, 1854.

Das Buch Henoch. Uebersetzt und erklärt von Dr. A. Dillmann. Leipzig, 1853.

Commentar zur Offenbarung Johannes. Von Dr. Gustav Volkmar. Zürich, 1862.

HOWEVER much sensible people and inductive philosophers may despise the literature of prophecy, the charm which it has for the religious imagination is not wholly chargeable on the weakness of human nature. No doubt it owes something to the mere impatience of men, in moments of suspense, at the darkness of the future; their longing to lift the veil which hides their rescue or their fall; their hope to extort from heaven some hint of foreknown but inaccessible events. Intense want disposes to easy belief: so that trust is readily attracted to an oracle that promises to fetch a voice from behind nature, or a writing that looks like a casket of Divine secrets. But, besides this source of interest, common to Delphi and to Zion, to Zadkiel and Isaiah, the Jewish apocalyptic productions have a fascination infinitely deeper and altogether special to themselves. They are no apparition of mere inquisitiveness under the mask of piety,—much less of imposture practising on credulity. They are a theory of the Past, not less than a guess at the Future: and, in truth, have no care about what may be in reserve for the world, except as the fifth Act of a sacred Drama, already developed into tragic depths. It is the peculiarity and the glory of the Hebrew faith that, in its view, all history fell into the form of a moral problem on the sublimest scale, and appeared not simply as the play of human passions, but as the stately march of a Divine thought: and to read the law and order of that thought as it passed on and left its trace,—to complete it by divination where there was no guide but inward sympathy with its intent, was the hope that animated every retrospect and every prospect. Historian and seer were in one, “beset” by an almighty righteousness “behind and before.” We are aware of nothing like this in Pagan literature. No hint of a Providential education of the human race, of a moral organism of nations, working out at last the universal supremacy of truth and right, do we remember in even the more religious of the ancient philosophers. To Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca, the Divine element of the world appeared, not in the historical vicissitudes of humanity, but in the kosmical

constancy and order ;—not in any moral life through Time, but in the eternal beauty distributed through Space. The *Timæus*,—the Greek book of Genesis,—exhibits the origin, the harmony, the movement of the universe,—not omitting to find a place in it for human souls: but such as it is at first, such is it for ever; changing only with an eternal periodicity, and with no life able to break the cycle of alternate birth and death. The Hebrew cosmogony, on the other hand, hurries rapidly down into ethnology: once having built the heavens and the earth, it leaves them to tell their story, and follows the Divine clue into the families and societies of men. The genius of their races, the migrations of their tribes, the passions of their leaders, even the aberrations of their faith, are searched for the vestiges of a comprehensive plan. And the problem, started at the very cradle of this literature, haunts and possesses it throughout. The sense of some great meaning shut up in the constitution of humanity never deserts it. Often fainting under its long patience, sometimes presumptuous with sudden hope, it changes its voice as the winds of Providence breathe high or low: but the feeling recovers from every temporary silence: and just when great tyrannies and overshadowing Paganism threaten to crush it out, it is heard in tones at once of deepest pathos and of highest trust. It would be vain to look elsewhere for a religion which has consecrated universal history.

The expression of this Jewish feeling is not confined within the limits of the Bible: and in a former number of this Review we gave some account of the form which it assumes in the "*Sibylline Oracles*,"—a production referable, in its oldest part, to an Alexandrine Jew, about B.C. 160. We propose to take up our sketch from that point, and present such traces as we can find of the Jewish theory of history, and especially of its Messianic consummation, in writings somewhat less ancient. The whole interest of the investigation is relative to the New Testament. We wish to picture clearly to ourselves the state of mind which pre-occupied the first teachers and hearers of Christianity, to travel back, under almost contemporary guidance, into the circle of ideas which environed them; that, in the complex texture of Scripture, woven of old thought and new, we may be the better able to trace the thread of light winding through the staple material of the age. For this purpose, it is obvious, none but præ-Christian writings are of any avail: and the nearer our witnesses stand to the evangelic time itself, the more illustrative is their evidence as to the religious conceptions brought into the Church by its first disciples. Can we lay our hands, then, on any remains of Jewish prophetic literature from the century immediately preceding our era? We believe so:

and we proceed to justify and apply this judgment with regard to that singular production, the "Book of Enoch."

Many an English reader has been puzzled by a couple of verses in the Epistle of Jude (14, 15): "Now Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied concerning these also, saying,— 'Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have impiously committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.'" Ante-diluvian words are hard to recover: whence did the author get these of Enoch's? The work from which he took them, and which he evidently quotes as both authentic history and true prophecy, lies on the table before us; and is the second in the list at the head of this article. From the 8th to the 18th century it was entirely lost from view, and was known only by citations from it scattered through the patristical writings: and even these, though numerous down to the time of Augustine, disappear from that date in the Western Church, and owe their further continuance to the different taste of the Byzantine Christians. With the Greek fragments preserved in Georgius Syncellus the chronographer (about A.D. 795) the book vanishes into its long sleep. It was not till the year 1773 that it returned to the light. Bruce, the African traveller, found it still extant in Abyssinia among the biblical books:—and from two Æthiopic manuscripts which he brought to Europe the work was translated into English, and given to the world in 1821, by Laurence, afterwards Archbishop of Cashel. For this *editio princeps* little can be said, except that it secured attention to a curious monument of ecclesiastical antiquity, and served as a basis for a more critical reproduction and version of the text. The latest result, facilitated by the labours of Hoffmann and the acquisition of additional manuscripts, is the excellent German translation, with introduction and notes, by Professor Dillmann of Tübingen. Perhaps even this edition, which in the main, we have no doubt, faithfully represents the original work, hardly makes sufficient allowance for its exclusive custody, through so many ages, by the Christian Church. It is hardly to be expected that a Jewish apocalypse should be quite safe, for hundreds of years, in Christian keeping: and, had the book been also preserved among the Rabbinical memorials, the various readings would probably disclose, in our actual text, many unsuspected assimilations to the language of the New Testament.

The citation of this book in the Epistle of Jude will satisfy most persons of its præ-Christian origin, and be accepted as a

first step in determining its date. For although that Epistle is one of the books of disputed authority, the doubts respecting it have not been suggested by any indications of post-apostolic origin; and indeed have no more serious foundation than the use which the writer makes of an apocryphal book. Apart from this fanciful objection, there is nothing to disturb the usual judgment, which refers the letter to a time earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem. How far we must still go back to reach the origin of the Book of Enoch is a question certainly of much difficulty; depending for its solution entirely on successful analysis of the contents of the work. Dillmann, who attributes the whole production,—except two later sections,—to a single hand, assigns it to the closing years of John Hyrcanus, about 110 B.C. Ewald detects in it five component elements, of which three arose between the years 144 and 128 B.C., and the whole were fused into their present form by the middle of the next century. An acute criticism of Köstlin's reduces the constituent documents to three, and changes their chronological order; but adopts Dillmann's date for the oldest portion, and brings the newest no further down than the age of Herod the Great. We seem therefore to stand secure within the limits of the three half-centuries before our era.

Recently, it is true, this conclusion has been disturbed from its repose by a critic equally ingenious and adventurous—Volkmarm of Zürich. Denying, with Bruno Bauer, that any formed Messianic doctrine existed among the præ-Christian Jews, and believing that this whole system of ideas first constituted itself around the person of Jesus,—he contends that (the Sibyl excepted) the entire Jewish literature of this class arose out of rivalry with the Christian apocalypse, and was formed on the immediate suggestion, not of the book of Daniel, but of the Revelations of John. To its coincidences therefore with the language and conceptions of the New Testament he applies an inverse explanation: the synagogue copies from the church all its Messianic scenery and drama; and only changes, or represents by nameless symbols, the chief personage in the plot. The book of Enoch indeed was written in the interest of a particular pretender to the Messianic office,—Bar-cochab, the "false Christ" of Hadrian's reign,—and issued from the school of his principal follower, the Rabbi Akiba. As the insurrection under this pretender occurred A.D. 132, and the book which it produced was in the hands of a New Testament writer, a still later date must be assigned to some portion of our canonical writings: and, under the exigencies of his theory, Volkmarm accordingly transposes into the second century not only the Epistle of Jude, but a large part of the Christian Scriptures; keeping back

the Gospel of Matthew and the Acts of the Apostles till A.D. 105-115, the first Epistle of Peter till A.D. 140-147, and the fourth Gospel till after the middle of the century.

Bold hypotheses like this are not to be regretted. They compel the bench of criticism to reconsider its verdicts, and, in case of reasonable doubt, to grant a new trial. But, except as a provocative of severer scrutiny, Volkmar's speculation appears to us a barren exercise of skill. It is a violent inversion of the natural order of development of faith;—which always proceeds from the less to the more determinate, and would follow its own law in fitting a preëxistent Messianic image on to a particular individual; but would never prefix a newly-invented ideal to an historical life,—much less,—like Volkmar's anti-Christian Jews,—disown the life, yet borrow the ideal. And though, when two writings present the same ideas, it is often perplexing to say which was first, and a little adroitness may work the explanation either way, yet, if the concurrences and differences are taken together, there will usually arise a balance of superior simplicity, practically decisive of the order of derivation. In the present instance, we find it impossible to compare certain passages,—to which we shall presently refer,—of the Book of Enoch with portions of the New Testament, without assurance that we have here a middle term between the Hebrew and the Evangelic faith.

The aim of the author is to reconcile the Hebrew ideal of the world with the disappointing phenomena which seemed to contradict it; to give an account of human ills and tedious oppressions without prejudice to the righteousness of the Divine Government. Partly by throwing the blame on secondary free agents, partly by treating all the Past as probationary, but chiefly by drawing on the Future for redress, he brings out the Eternal justice clear. Nay, so completely, in his view, does a Moral idea dominate the universe, that its physical structure, geographical and astronomical, has been determined by nothing else: its deserts are for penal exile of wicked spirits; its mountains are dungeon-doors; its stars are free and bright in their obedience, or chained together in guilt and sorrow; and not far from one of its cardinal points, hid behind the horizon, are already prepared the throne of judgment and the nursery garden of the trees of Paradise. The machinery by which effect is given to this general aim is supplied by two mysterious legends from the book of Genesis;—that of the union of "the sons of God" with "the daughters of men" (Gen. vi. 1-4); and that of the translation of Enoch (Gen. v. 24). By the former the writer explains the inroad of evil upon humanity, and the spoiling of the world: and in the latter

he finds a link of communication whereby the remedial measures devised in heaven may be revealed on earth.

We are accustomed to father our sins and miseries upon Adam, and to date them from a certain dialogue between Eve and the Serpent. Our author transposes the origin of evil to a later time, and brings his indictment against other agents. In the time of Jared, Enoch's father, two hundred Angels, ranged in tens under separate leaders, descended from heaven; and, forming connexions with "the daughters of men," became the parents of an intermediate and "giant" race. This rebellious migration brought with it all the maladies of the world: Feminine artifice wrested from the new-comers forbidden secrets of the higher sphere,—astrology and magic,—and taxed their invention for the production of vain ornaments: while men were put upon ruinous and destructive ways, and taught how to fabricate the weapons of war. The monstrous progeny, inheriting a double taint, oppress and devour mankind, and raise the confusion to such a pitch that, in pure compassion at the sight, four of the unfallen angels report the case to the Most High, and obtain commissions to arrest the ruin and punish the guilt. The instructions given to them extend far beyond the immediate exigency, and include provisions for the whole future course and for the final consummation of human history. To meet the necessities of the moment, the giants are set on one another for mutual destruction: their disembodied spirits being still able, however, as dæmons, to ride on the clouds and haunt the earth and afflict mankind till the day of judgment. The spoiled human race is swept away by the Flood,—Noah being warned and reserved to begin a better time. To crush the causes of ill, the good angels are to capture and incarcerate their fallen companions;—to chain one of the chiefs in the desert,—to bury another beneath the hills, for seventy generations, till the day of judgment. To provide for the moral training of humanity, and prepare the germ of a righteousness that shall triumph at last, the archangel Michael (always the special patron of the Jews) is to "plant the plants of holiness,"—that is, to mark out the race through which the Divine traditions are to be preserved, and the Divine idea pass to its realisation. With this selection of a sacred clan in the re-peopling of the earth, and its opening divergency from non-Semitic tribes, begins the historical and human drama of the world. The ante-diluvian period is mythological, mixing up the incidents of heaven and earth, of mortal and immortal races, of monsters and of men; and leaving behind, after all the measures of redress, a legacy of evil powers in the air to torment the bodies and deceive the souls of men. And as

angelic natures appear in the prologue, so do they re-appear in the epilogue, of the story of mankind. The post-diluvian ages, through long vicissitudes of probation, lead up to the great terrestrial assizes with which Messiah's reign begins: and that is the consummation of history. But, when this is over, the celestial assizes yet remain; at which incorporeal natures shall be brought up for sentence, and the imprisoned angels meet their final doom. This fourfold division of time,—an earthly probation and judgment, embraced between the two corresponding terms of a heavenly,—forms the invariable Hebrew program of the Providential designs.

The ripe mythological form given to this ante-diluvian sketch, the familiarity of the writer with the statistics and names of the angels, and his ascription of dæmoniacal possession to the wandering souls of giants, have been urged in proof of the late origin of this book. It introduces us to a circle of ideas,—especially to an organised doctrine of angels and dæmons,—which, according to Volkmar, first formed itself in the second century of our era. But in truth we know little of the chronology and growth of these conceptions among the Jews; and that little affords us glimpses of them at a much earlier date. Daniel is already acquainted with the names of Michael and Gabriel, and with the functions of other members of the heavenly host: and it is not probable that the ideal population of the heavenly world, thus far introduced to the imagination, contained no other definite personalities than these. Indeed, we have a curious and conclusive evidence of a systematised doctrine on this subject in the last præ-Christian century, if not before. The Essenic communities in the south of Palestine admitted no probationer, at the end of his novitiate, without administering to him a solemn oath: and among the obligations imposed upon him was this,—that he should not *disclose the names of the Angels*. Further, we find Philo giving to the legend in Genesis the same fanciful interpretation on which our author proceeds: "the sons of God" he also identifies with "Angels:" and the "Giants" are their wicked offspring from human mothers.* Souls, dæmons, angels, are but different names, he says, applied to the hierarchy of incorporeal natures; of which some are good and some depraved, both among those that are born into human life, and among those that retain their purely spiritual essence.† The dæmonology of the synoptical gospels, though giving us no personal name but that of Beelzebub, has all the marks of an established and well-understood doctrine;—of a doctrine indeed so familiar

* *Questionum et solutionum in Genesin.* Sermo i. § 92.

† *De mundo*, iii.

and determinate as to furnish the most conclusive tests of Messiahship, and play a principal part in the evangelical polemic. Nor could the apostle Paul, in his instructions about the dress of Christian women in the churches,* have insisted on veiling them from the gaze of evil angels,—hinting his reason in the brief phrase “because of the angels,”—had not the story in Genesis been universally understood in the sense of the Book of Enoch. From these indications we must infer that, at and before our era, the atmosphere of Jewish thought was charged with the beliefs to which the work before us gives definite expression.

The plan having been formed in heaven for redressing the evils of the earth, recourse is had to Enoch—already translated—to convey its messages and reveal it to mankind. Human in race, celestial in abode, with the affections of one world and the insight of another, he is the fittest link of communication between the two realms. He is sent accordingly by the chief angels to warn their fallen comrades of their doom: and finding them near Lebanon, so shamed by sin and fear as to shrink from immediate prayer, he is moved to act as their scribe and write an intercession for them. Retiring with the scroll to the Southwest of Hermon, and sitting down to read it by the river of Dan, he falls asleep; and, in a dream which takes him before the face on which none can gaze, is ordered back with the petition, and charged to say, “You ought rather to intercede for men, than men for you.”

His errand to the fallen Angels over, Enoch has to be prepared to carry notices of Divine intent to men. For this purpose he is again sent out, now under guidance of archangels, round the whole circuit of the world, to have its mysteries explained, and especially the function of each part in the moral scheme of the Creator. Of all that his conductors tell him he takes notes, and preserves the record in some curious chapters on physics: whose romantic and childish astronomy show how much Uriel himself needed the guidance of an Hipparchus, a Cassini, or a Humboldt. The kosmical picture presented is that of a great terrestrial plain, sustaining on the rim of the horizon the vault of the firmament: which is pierced with a row of six doors in the East, and six in the West, for the Sun’s ingress and egress at different times of the year. For a month at Midsummer it uses the Northernmost doors; for a like time in Midwinter, the Southernmost; and month by month between, it steps, forward or backward, to the next intermediate door. Whether the sun itself is ball or disk is not very clear: but it is conveyed through its diurnal course in a chariot

* 1 Cor. xi. 10.

driven by the wind; and nightly conducted back through the North, apparently by an angel, since no physical cause is provided to accomplish the feat. It is needless to follow the system into its details; but most important to fix in the imagination its general structure: for the Hebrew theology and physics hang closely together; and the unconscious attempt to transpose its ancient faith into our modern universe entails innumerable illusions, exegetical and religious. In a kosmos which makes the earth the base of heaven, and unites them as the lower and upper stories of the same house, geography and astronomy become one; the inhabitants of each level are drawn into the life of the other; the council chamber is above, but all the realisations are below;—the whole destiny of humanity is to be wrought out, not by any transcendental migration, but on a terrestrial spot, in simple continuation of history. To this all the architecture of the inaccessible parts is subservient: it has its prisons of detention, its chambers of preservation, for souls that are gone but will come again; its caverns of torture ready for incorrigible men in one place, angels in another; and its furniture and apparatus in reserve for the scene of judgment and the reign of peace.

We are not therefore to be surprised if, accompanying Enoch in his survey, we find ourselves transferred, with little interval, from the "*flammanitia mœnia mundi*" to the suburbs of Jerusalem; and learn that whatever we have seen near the verge of heaven is only to dress the stage of the Judæan drama. Led first to the West, he is shown the gathering-place of departed souls, here for the wicked, there for the good, till the hour of judgment; and a vast fire into which the lights of heaven dip to renew their flames. Passing to the South, he sees, with three lesser heights on either side, the mountain throne prepared for the Supreme Judge, when he shall come down to judge the world; and, among the trees around, one of sweet odour, explained to be the tree of life, intended, at the consummation of all things, to be given to the elect, to be transplanted into the neighbourhood of the Temple in the North, and to give each partaker of its fruit a life of patriarchal length and painless vigour. His curiosity having been awakened about the tree, he is taken at once to look at the place whither it is to be transplanted. As the description of it fixes definitively the locality of the Messianic reign, and contributes some important elements to the picture, we will quote it as it stands:

"And thence I went to the middle of the earth,* and saw a blessed

* As the Greeks considered their Delphi to be the *θεῖς ὀμφαλὸν ἐπιβρόμιον χθονὸς* (Pind. Pyth. vi. 3), and believed the white stone of its temple to be the mid-point of the earth's surface, so did the Jews assign the same central position to their mount Zion (Ezek. v. 5, xxxviii. 12).

and fruitful place, where there were branches sprouting and striking root from an ancient stock. And there I beheld a holy hill, and Eastward, at the foot of the hill, a stream flowing South. And to the East I saw another hill of equal height, and between the two a valley deep but not wide : in it also was a stream running towards me on the hill side. And West of this was another hill lower than the former and of no great height ; and below it, between the two, was a valley : and at the end of all the three were other valleys deep and dry. And all the valleys were deep, but not wide, of hard rock : but they were planted with trees. And I marvelled at the rocks, and marvelled at the valley, and was full of wonder" (26).

The topographical indications here are unmistakable ; as well as the symbolical designation of the Israelitish people as shoots from an old stem. Zion is the "holy hill," with Siloam at its foot flowing South ; the Mount of Olives the more Eastern hill of equal height ; with the deep valley and stream of Kedron between. The lower hill to the West of this is the "*Hill of Evil Counsel*," facing Zion to the South ; and the valley of Hinnom is the separating ravine. The limestone rocks, the olives planted on the upper slopes, and the dry gullies running off between the spurs of the three hills, are all accurately true to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The passage continues thus :

"Then I said : 'For what is this blessed land which is full of trees, and this accursed valley in the midst ?' Then Uriel, one of the holy angels with me, answered and said : 'This accursed valley is for those who shall be accursed to eternity : here must assemble all those who speak with their lips unseemly things against God and against his glory : here are they to be gathered, and this is the place of their punishment. And in the last times will the spectacle be given to the righteous, of a just judgment on these for ever and ever ; for which those who have found mercy will praise the Lord of glory, the eternal King : and in the days of that judgment will they praise him for the mercy wherewith he has appointed their lot.' Then did I also praise the Lord of glory, and spake to him, and thought of his greatness, as was fit" (27).

This is the earliest expression of the Jewish belief respecting the scene and mode of the Messianic crisis ; a belief which reappears in the New Testament, and prevailed with intense force in the early Church of Palestine ; and which, freeing itself from its geography as it passed among Gentile Christians, and even quitting this world altogether, developed itself into the doctrine of Hell and its everlasting torments. The Judgment, it is plain, was to take place near Jerusalem : and while the temple hill was to be the citadel of reward to the pious, the punishment of the wicked, in order to be within sight, would

take place in the valley of Hinnom below. This spot, it is quite evident, is not figuratively referred to, as furnishing merely a name and symbol for the invisible penalties of another world; but literally designated as their real topographical seat; precisely as the neighbouring heights are taken to be the proper metropolis of the elect. Both physical and historical causes inclined the Jewish imagination to select this particular valley for the fatal purpose. Stretching towards the volcanic district to the South, it is said to have emitted at times a smoke which betrayed subterranean fires, and which would receive from the Jew the same penal interpretation that his Scriptures had already put on the convulsions of the Asphaltite basin. And as the frequent scene of the rites of Moloch, it was associated with many horrors, and had received the curse of the prophets.*

The *place*, then, is fixed, and is now known to Enoch. The *time* is reserved for later revelations, soon to follow, and communicated through a new medium. At the close of his circuit through the universe, Enoch is shown certain tablets in heaven, on which are inscribed the Divine decrees respecting the course and the consummation of history; and also regular books, kept by appointed angels, in which the deeds of all mankind are recorded. Being permitted to study these, Enoch is qualified to become historical interpreter and prophet: and is then set down at the door of his house, to spend a year with his son Methuselah, and report to his descendants the scheme of the world's future. We are thus brought back from supramundane scenes to the level of human affairs; and have the field of time marked out before us in sections similar to those of Daniel and the Sibyl. Up to a certain point, we can identify these with known periods; and obtain thence a measure of the rest to the expected end: and we find the place of the author of the book at the point of junction between the two.

The whole reach of history is divided into ten periods, designated as "weeks;" each of which is apparently conceived, without much regard to any but the patriarchal duration of human life, as composed of seven generations. Though the limits of these are not precisely defined, each is marked by some distinctive event, which saves the chronology from being entirely indeterminate. At the end of the first, Enoch himself is born ("the seventh from Adam," Jude 14): in the second will be the judgment by Flood and the saving of Noah: the third is Abraham's week: the fourth, that of Moses: in the fifth comes the building of Solomon's temple: in the sixth is a time of

* Comp. 2 Kings xxxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 31-33, xix. 5-7, xxxii. 35; Is. xxiv. 15, 24.

blindness and division—the schism into two kingdoms ; during it, “a man will go upwards” (Elijah); and at its end the temple will be destroyed. During the seventh will arise an apostate race (the Samaritans?); but towards its close, the elect and faithful will be rewarded by receiving sevenfold instruction respecting the creation and the course of time, from one who has seen the things in heaven, and who has heard the voice of God and lived. As this “sevenfold instruction” is evidently the Book of Enoch itself, the author fixes his own time at this point, and leaves us to understand, what indeed is plain from the unhistoric haze investing the sequel, that the three remaining weeks were still future.* Before we pass to this ideal period, it may be useful to present the following synopsis of the historical weeks :

		B.C.
1st week ;	to the translation of Enoch . . . 987 years .	4004 to 3017
2d ”	to the covenant with Noah . . . 669 ” .	3017 to 2348
3d ”	to the birth of Isaac 462 ” .	2348 to 1886
4th ”	to the death of Joshua 442 ” .	1886 to 1444
5th ”	to the Dedication of the Temple 436 ” .	1444 to 1008
6th ”	to the destruction of the Temple 421 ” .	1008 to 587
7th ”	to the Author’s time (say) . . . 420 ” .	587 to 167

This would bring us to the time of Judas Maccabæus, which from other indications we judge to be somewhat too early. But, after every allowance for uncertainty in the terminal dates of the periods, it seems clearly to result from the general survey (1.) that the Week is unequal in duration, and cannot be intended to furnish a fixed unit of measurement : (2.) that after the Flood, it is much less than before, and is reduced to an average of about 450 years : (3.) that the composition of the Book of Enoch, referred to the end of the seventh week, must fall within the second præ-Christian century.

At this point we suddenly step off the terra firma of history into the Messianic cloud-land. In the eighth week, a sword is put into the hands of the righteous for the subjugation of a sinful world ; and before the period closes, heathenism is prostrate at their feet, and they have raised a house for their God, and made all ready for the Divine age. In the ninth week that age is at length realised : it is ushered in by a solemn judgment over the whole of this world ; which is cleared of every ill,

* It is remarkable that, as the text now stands, the Apocalypse of weeks is broken into two fragments, and that these fragments occur in the wrong order: the seven weeks of the author’s past being described in xciii. 1-14 ; and the three yet future in a previous chapter, viz. xci. 12-17. This may be a mere textual transposition, due to accidents of copying. But, taken in connexion with the eschatology of the three weeks, which is hardly consistent with the rest of the book and much more definite, it awakens a suspicion of some touches from a later hand.

divested of its old form, and glorified for the universal life of holiness. It is reserved for the tenth week to apply a like transformation to the upper world, and pass a corresponding judgment,—a “judgment of eternity,”—on the fallen angels: the former heaven will vanish away, and a new heaven will shape itself forth with lights of sevenfold lustre; and through weeks without number sin in either world will be no more known.

If we are to carry into these ideal periods any thing like the measures of length supplied by their historical predecessors, the author must have stood, as he conceived, on the verge of a long and final struggle between “the faithful people” and the Pagan powers of the world: and, for such an act of faith to be possible, he must have caught the excitement of some kindling time, when Gentile weakness or Jewish heroism gave a temporary expansion of national hope. An allowance of four hundred years for the conquest of Heathendom is certainly more liberal and long-suffering than is usual with the impatient apocalyptic race: who rarely choose to distance themselves so far from the golden age they predict. But, on the other hand, the same approximate measure, applied to the ninth or Messianic week, brings it into curious accord with the “Revelations of Esra,”—another important authority on these beliefs,—in which the reign of Messiah is expressly said to last four hundred years, and then by his death, and that of all mortals, to make way for the last and heavenly scene. It is singular that, in its apocalypse of weeks, the Book of Enoch is silent of any personal Messiah.

It is known how, in its several visions, the book of Daniel surveys again and again the same historical ground. Similarly our author, as if helping us to check one calculation by another, throws into the form of a dream, with fresh imagery and different numberings, the matter collected from the heavenly books. In this dream the several races of beings are represented by distinctive types of living nature; the wicked angels by stars; the good, by white human forms; the legendary giants, by camels, elephants, and asses; men, at first by oxen, but after Jacob’s time, as if to mark a dwindled humanity, by sheep: among which the *rams* are the kings, and their horns the signs of power. It is only, however, in the pure line of the Hebrews that these pastoral emblems are admitted. The Heathen nations appear under the guise of species wilder or of low repute: Egypt, as the wolf; Chaldæa, as the lion; Idumæa, as the swine. With these allegorical equivalents the whole history is gone through, clumsily but intelligibly enough. A single passage may be cited, describing the building of the

temple, the sending of the prophets, and the mysterious fate of Elijah :

" Above that house (*i. e.* Jerusalem) was built a high tower (*i. e.* the Temple) for the Lord of the sheep. The house was low, but the tower lofty : and the Lord of the sheep stood upon that tower ; and they set a full table before him. And again I saw how those sheep went astray and abandoned that house of theirs. And the Lord of the sheep called some from among them and sent them to the sheep ; but the sheep began to kill them. And one of them saved himself from the slaughter, and arose and raised a cry about the sheep : and they were for killing him ; but the Lord of the sheep saved him out of their hand, and fetched him up here to me, and let him dwell there" (lxxxix. 50-54).

Through the infatuation of the lost sheep the house and tower are abandoned of heaven, and given up to lions, tigers, and jackals. In his pity for the scattered flock, Enoch is on the point of interceding for them ; when he is silenced by learning the Divine counsels respecting them from the exile to Mes-siah's time. These are as follows.

The sheep are to be surrendered, during this interval, to seventy shepherds in succession : who will not be restrained from a certain limited range of oppression over them ; but of whose proceedings a recording Angel will keep account, that they may be held responsible for every excess. The earlier critics not unnaturally supposed that those who tended the sheep must be their own native rulers ; and went accordingly, with this clue in hand, through the domestic history of Palestine in search of seventy suitable princes. But the shepherds, who are all at last committed to the flames of Hinnom, are evidently the Pagan powers to whose hands the sheep are left for temporary chastisement. The first twelve, moreover, complete their time during the exile, when there was only foreign sway, and cover precisely Jeremiah's seventy years. Just double that number* fill up the succeeding Persian period, from Cyrus to Alexander the Great : a period of which we know little, but which our author describes as enfeebling his people's nationality and fatally mingling them with the populations around. Then appears a new race of world-oppressors, the Macedonian Græeks, symbolised as birds of prey ; the first conquerors, by the eagle ; the Syrian Seleucidæ, by the raven ;

* Unless, indeed, we accept Dillmann's conjecture of 23 instead of 24 : without which the original total of 70 will not come out correctly as the sum of the several items. In that case the series will be composed of two equal parts of 35 ; each made up, in similar but inverted portions, of 12 and 23 : viz. 12 for the Exile ; 23 from Cyrus to Alexander : thence 23 to Antiochus Epiphanes ; and 12 more, to complete the drama. The difficulty is, that the second term is not mentioned by itself ; but, massed with the first, is said to give 36, or, by a various reading, 37 (instead of 35). Volkmar, accepting 37, alters the total accordingly into 72.

the Ptolemies, by the hawk. When twenty-three of these have accomplished their time, and make up the number in all to 58, the sheep, fairly torn to pieces, are reduced to few, and those few are but living skeletons. The description forcibly paints the sufferings of Palestine as the battle-ground of Egypt and Syria, oppressed by the forces of both, corrupted by the alliance of each; till shame and misery raised at length the standard of religious war. The double relation of the country to these two rival powers explains the number of "shepherds" given to so short a term (about 330 to 170 B.C.); the 23 including contemporaneous princes of both lands. The final period opens differently from the preceding ones; not with the appearance of some new order of "shepherds," but with the growth of a new spirit among the "sheep." A fresh generation sees with painful clearness, and brooks with little patience, the political and religious humiliation of their country. "Young lambs, born to the sheep, begin to open their eyes and to call to the sheep;" at first, with vain appeal; but afterwards, through the discipline of a long struggle with the Syrian birds of prey, with increasing success: till at length a "horn" of power appears which resists assault from all sides, and maintains itself against every combination. At this point, the historical terminus is reached: and since, in leading up to it, the twelve residuary "shepherds" are all expended, it must lie at some distance from the incipient Maccabæan revolt, with which the section opens. It is fixed, by Ewald and Dillmann, on grounds deserving of reliance, at the culmination of John Hyrcanus's career; before he turned aside to the Sadducees' party, and forfeited the homage of the Jewish Puritans. If the effectual establishment of national independence, and the maintenance of it for a quarter of a century, did not entitle him to be called a "great horn," no previous member of the Asmonæan family could show a superior claim. With all their personal heroism, his predecessors for two generations had been rather party-leaders than national chiefs; and had conducted, with fluctuating success, the contest which he at last brought to consolidated results. A pious Jew who, about B.C. 110, looked round him from Jerusalem, and behold the yoke of Syria shaken off, Samaria humbled, Idumæa converted and incorporated; who saw how "the ancient men sat all in the streets, communing together of the wealth of the land, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel;" might well persuade himself that the dawn of promise was beginning to appear, and the Messianic age at hand.

Accordingly, the shepherds' time being up, supernatural imagery pours down into the dream. At the threat of a com-

bined attack upon the sheep by deserters from their own number, and by wild heathen powers, first the archangel Michael, then the Lord of the sheep himself, come down to defend the right. On being shown, from the recording angel's books, that the last twelve shepherds have exceeded their commission, the Lord, with a stroke of his staff on the ground, causes many of the wild races to sink into the earth ; and gives a sword to the sheep to drive away the remaining beasts of the field and birds of heaven. Thereupon, a throne was erected in the favourite land ; and the Lord of the sheep sat on it, and all the sealed books were opened before him. He desires the archangels to bring before him, first, the stars (*i. e.* the fallen angels), then, the seventy shepherds :

“ And lo ! I saw them all in bonds, as they stood before him. And judgment was passed first on the stars ; and they were found guilty, and went to the place of condemnation, and were thrown into a fiery deep, full of spires of flame. And those seventy shepherds were judged and found guilty, and thrown in like manner into that fiery deep. And then I saw, how a similar deep, full of fire, was opened amid the earth ; and the sheep that were blinded were brought up for trial, and all judged guilty, and thrown into that fiery deep : there they burned : and this deep was to the right (*i. e.* south) of that house (Jerusalem). And I saw how those sheep burned, and their bone burned. And I stood up to see, till he wrapped up that old house, and did away with all the pillars ; and all the beams and ornaments of that house were wrapped up with it ; and it was cast out and put in a place at the South of the land. And I beheld the Lord of the sheep, till he brought a new house (Jerusalem), greater and higher than that first, and set it up on the site of the first which had been wrapped up : all its pillars were new, and its ornaments were new and exceeded the former old ones which he had cast away : and all the sheep were in it. And I saw all the sheep that had remained, and all the beasts of the earth, and all the birds of heaven, how they fell down and did homage before those sheep, and entreated them, and obeyed them in every word. And after that, the three in white clothing who had previously led me up, took my hand ; and, the hand of that young man (Elijah) holding me, they set me down among those sheep, before the judgment took place. And those sheep were all white, and their fleece thick and pure. And all the ruined and scattered sheep, and beasts of the field and birds of the air were gathered in that house ; and the Lord of the sheep had great joy, because they were all good, and returned to his house. And I beheld till they laid down that sword which had been given to the sheep, and brought it back into his house, and sealed it up before the face of the Lord, and all the sheep were gathered into that house and it could not hold them. And the eyes of all were opened, so that they saw the good ; and there was not one among them that had not sight. And I saw that that house was great and wide, and very full. And I saw that a white bullock was born, with great horns ; and all the beasts

of the field and birds of heaven feared him and entreated him continually. And I beheld, till all their kinds were changed, and they all became white bullocks : and the first among them was a great creature,* and had great black horns upon his head ; and the Lord of the sheep took pleasure in them and in the bullocks" (xc. 23-38).

When compared with the Apocalypse of Weeks, this Vision of the Seventy Shepherds presents some notable peculiarities :

(1.) Its historical chronology comes down to a more definite and a somewhat later time, to the end, instead of the beginning, of the religious war.

(2.) Its picture of the judgment is single ; bringing angels and men to sentence at the same time ; and taking the Angels first ; instead of leaving their trial to a second assize at the end of the Messianic reign.

(3.) It introduces a personal Messiah ; not indeed as Judge, but as Head of the theocracy after the Divine judgment had been pronounced ; representing him as simply a human being of the original ante-diluvian type (a "white bullock was born"), — a type into which, on his appearance, all other men are changed.

These differences arise, we have no doubt, from different authorship. Nor can we doubt, respecting the two doctrines of the last Judgment, which is the older : for the natural order of development is always from the less to the more determinate. The one general assize for all beings would suffice for the earlier and simpler retributive feeling ; and only afterwards, when the differences between immortal angels and historic men were dwelt upon, would their cases seem to require a separate provision ; and a judgment for time would be opened to fit this world for Messiah ; while at the other end of the theocracy a "judgment for eternity" would be reserved for spiritual natures. The later hand, however, from which comes the more specific picture in the Apocalypse of Weeks, is still proved, by its terminal historical touches, to be of so early a date that, in tracing its lessons, we are probably studying the lineaments, if not of the original author's generation, at least of the next.

By these two numerical revelations, then, the *Time* of the

* As the text now stands, there is here an absurd gloss introduced, which has been ignorantly turned to Christian purposes, and defended in spite of its obvious character of interpolation. The passage, with the corruption, runs thus : "And the first among them [was the Word, and that Word] was a great creature and had great black horns upon his head." Dillmann shows that the Ethiopic term here rendered "Word" means, not *λόγος*, but *βῆμα*, and cannot have been written, even as a gloss, with any intention to identify the bullock (i.e. Messiah) with the Johannine "Word." He supposes that, on the margin, some one wrote, in Greek characters, a Hebrew equivalent for the term rendered "bullock" : this would be *בְּהֵמָה* ; which a copyist, turning into *βῆμα*, inserted in the text. The Logos doctrine is absolutely foreign to the Messianic idea : and the violence of its intrusion here is self-evident.

Messianic advent appears to be fixed to the post-Asmonæan age, not less definitely than its *Place* to Jerusalem. No other conclusion can be drawn, unless we gratuitously supply data which the text does not place at our disposal. Volkmar does this, when he assumes that for each of the shepherds (of whom he reckons 72) we must allow a decade, and so look for the writer's Messiah at the end of 720 years from the commencement of the Captivity (558 B.C.), i.e. in 132 A.D., the date of Bar-chochab's revolt. Hilgenfeld does this, when he similarly assumes a constant unit, only making it *seven* years, instead of ten. The calculation which he thus gives us ($558 - 449 = 109$ B.C.) has not the misleading effect of Volkmar's: for it hits approximately the true date: and it has a plausible ground of defence as an interpretation, like Daniel's, of Jeremiah's seventy weeks. But it creates difficulties in the subordinate sections of the period: it forces on the writer a measure which he would hardly have omitted, if his meaning required its use: and it elicits no reliable result which does not arise from the unaugmented text.

It is remarkable that the writer of these revelations should be so preoccupied with the historical aspect of his theocratic faith, as almost to forget the dead, and feel his picture of the world complete with mention only of the living generation upon it. A perfectly analogous phenomenon, however, presents itself in the gospel of Matthew: where the solemn judgment before the Son of Man gathers together "all nations," but no dead, and is evidently passed, if we measure it by the Evangelist's conception as he wrote, only on the contemporary generation. In each instance, we should not know, but for other parts of the same book, whether the author admitted the faithful of earlier days to share in the "kingdom to come." The Book of Enoch, however, leaves no doubt on this point. In the exhortations which the "Prophet" addresses to his descendants, as the practical issue of his disclosures, no topic of warning and encouragement is more earnestly insisted on, than the certainty of righteous recompense to departed souls, and their sure custody in Hades to the hour of judgment. "The righteous," it is said, "will arise from their sleep: and wisdom will arise and be given them." The holy Angels are set to watch them; and however long their sleep may be, they have nothing to fear: "grace and joy and honour are prepared for you, and recorded in the books for the spirits who have died in righteousness: so that you will be compensated abundantly for your troubles: and your lot is better than the lot of the living. And your spirits will live,—you that have died in righteousness—and will have joy: and the remembrance of you will be before

the face of the Mighty One for all generations of the world : fear not therefore in the hour of humiliation." "The angels will remember you for good before the face of the Mighty One." "You will shine as the lights of heaven and be seen : and the gates of heaven will be open to you : and you will have joy as the angels of heaven." On the other hand, the transgressors' souls, even in Hades, will fare ill and have great trouble : while at the judgment they will be consigned to darkness and perplexity and burning fire : they will be thrown into the fiery furnace and perish in Hinnom. Yet throughout, it is evident, the theatre of all this retribution is still terrestrial, and its concomitant circumstances military and historical. The transgressors are delivered into the hands of the righteous, who "will break the necks of them : " the horses will wade through the sinners' blood : the angels will come down and help, and will assemble all the wicked into one place. The recall therefore from Hades is still a recall to this earth : and the new life is a resumption of the old, under conditions which exclude its humiliations and realise its true idea.

It remains for us only to notice one topic :—the representation which the Book of Enoch gives of the person of Messiah. With no element of the work is it so difficult to deal. If we merely collect together all the pertinent passages from the present text, and throw down their lineaments upon the canvass, no clear image results, but a mere assemblage of incoherent and even incompatible members. Yet if we proceed to discharge, as interpolation, what seems most disturbing to the unity of the figure, we have little to guide us but a critical feeling which involves a world of prior theological judgments, and is scarcely communicable from school to school. We can only present and combine the facts, and report the impressions which they appear to justify.

The solitary mention of Messiah which we have yet encountered is indisputably genuine, and may be taken, more securely than any other, as a standard for the oldest writer's point of view. What, then, is the doctrine of that passage? After the judgment is over, there is born, within the happy community, one who is to be their Head ; who exhibits their nature in its primeval perfection ; and under whom they all lay aside their degenerate forms, and recover the true proportions of humanity. It is impossible more decidedly to detach Messiah from the celestial region, and more clearly to mark his terrestrial affinities, than by applying to him the special Adamic symbols, and calling him a "great white bullock with black horns." No such imagery could have proceeded from a writer who imagined him pre-existent in heaven, and assimilated him to the host of

spirits, or associated him immediately with the Most High. For that higher world our author, as we have seen, has also his appropriate symbolism from which he never deviates; and nothing less refined than white human forms can enter his allegory there. His actual language, then, is consistent only with a strictly humanitarian conception. Yet when he winds up the exhortations of this very section, with an enumeration of Messianic blessings, he introduces the Most High, as saying, by way of encouragement to the righteous, "*I and my Son will unite ourselves with them for evermore.*" Except the brief mention of the "white bullock" in a far-off chapter, this is the only allusion to Messiah in the whole section: and nothing can be more strange than his sudden appearance here, like a familiar image, unless it be the new name,—"*Son of God,*"—by which he is introduced,—a name nowhere else occurring in the whole volume. It seems to us an incredible incongruity that a writer who shrinks from exhibiting even the angels under animal symbols should in one place present Messiah as a "white bullock," and in another speak of him as Son and Assessor of the Most High. We reject therefore this ἀπαξ λεγόμενον as evidence of nothing except the tampering of some Christian hand.

While the notices of Messiah are, for the most part, scant and few, even where the scene and times to which he belongs are painted in ample detail, there is one section of the book (xxxvii.-lxxi.) in which this reticence disappears, and he forms the main subject of revelation. Chiefly, indeed, to see him and learn who he is and what his function, is Enoch conducted in these chapters to the interior heaven, where dwell the spiritual Agents of God's reserved purposes. The spectacle presented to the "Prophet" is already familiar to us: it is precisely Daniel's vision (vii.) of the Ancient of Days and of "One like the Son of Man:" only that the symbolic vagueness of the original is all removed, and, in conformity with the later interpretation, the human figure is treated, not as standing for the "holy nation," but as an individual Person,—the real and pre-existent Messiah:

"And there I saw one who had a head of days (the Ancient of Days), and had his head white as wool. And beside him there was another, whose countenance was as the face of a man; and his countenance was full of grace, like one of the Angels. And I asked one of the Angels who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, about that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Ancient of Days. And he answered me and said: 'This is the Son of Man, who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who reveals all the treasures of that

which is hid; because the Lord of Spirits has made election of him, and his lot before the Lord of Spirits has exceeded all, through righteousness, for ever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will remove kings and mighty men from their places and the violent from their thrones, and will loose the bands of the violent, and will break the teeth of sinners. And he will thrust kings from their thrones and out of their empires, because they exalt and praise him not, and do not thankfully acknowledge the source whence their empire is lent" (46).

We cannot perhaps with certainty construe this language to mean more than the Divine *fore-ordination* of Messiah: his actual *pre-existence* is not necessarily affirmed by his presence to the prophet's vision: for it is characteristic of the *seer's* gift to assemble synchronously before him objects which are to enter successively the field of reality. And the same doubt,—as if it hung about the writer's own mind,—attaches to his phraseology elsewhere. More than once he speaks of the *appointment*,—never outright of the *living agency*,—of Messiah, "before the world was:" for instance, in these striking words:

"And at that hour was that Son of Man named before the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Ancient of Days. Ere yet the sun and the constellations were created, ere the stars of heaven were made, was his name named before the Lord of Spirits. He will be a staff to the righteous and holy, that they sustain themselves thereon and do not fall: and he will be the light of the peoples, and the hope of those who are troubled in heart. All who dwell upon the earth will fall down in entreaty before him, and will celebrate and exalt and praise the name of the Lord of Spirits. And therefore was he elected and hid before him, ere the world was created, and will be before him to eternity" (xlviii. 2-6).

From the parallelism between Past and Future in these concluding words Dillmann infers that more than *fore-ordination* must be meant: as the *post-existence* "to all eternity" is real, so must be the *pre-existence* "ere the world was created." But the inference overlooks an important difference in the things asserted by the two clauses: Messiah is "*to be*" before God (*i. e.* in actual existence) "to all eternity:" he was only "elected and *hid*" before Him (*i. e.* determined in idea, but *reserved*) "ere the world was created." We do not know why there should be this invariable shrinking from direct ascription to Messiah of some antecedent part in the drama of the world, unless belief itself was still lingering on the idea of simple *fore-appointment*, and had not yet taken the step into a doctrine of *pre-existence*.

So prominent is this conception of Divine appointment, that "*The Elect*" is, throughout this section, the standing title

of Messiah; as the same word, in the plural, denotes his subjects. In this capacity he is much less identified with the human race than we have hitherto found; is invested with functions elsewhere not delegated by the Most High; and especially with the office of Judge at the final crisis:

"Sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits," it is said, "are reserved for the day of anguish and consternation. On that day will the Elect (singular) sit upon the throne of his glory, and hold a discriminative judgment of their deeds and countless positions. And their spirit will grow strong within them, when they see mine Elect, and those who have called upon my holy and glorious name. And in that day I will cause my Elect to dwell among them; and will change the heaven and make it an eternal light and blessing: and I will change the earth and make it blessing, and let mine elect (plural) dwell upon it. But those who commit sin and transgression shall not set foot upon it. For I have seen and satisfied my righteous with peace, and set them before me: but for sinners I have reserved a judgment, to make them perish from the surface of the earth" (xlv. 3-6).

Compared with the first rude sketch which we assumed as a standard, all these attributes,—of Judge, Elect, Son of Man,—constitute a marked advance, involving not merely a fuller, but a changed belief. They bring the conception, as every reader must feel, much nearer to the representations in the gospels. Still, there is not one of them that has not its germ in the Old Testament, and might not be elicited thence by modes of interpretation which we know to have prevailed in the præ-Christian synagogue. The Messianic meanings which apostles and evangelists extorted from the Hebrew Scriptures were not personal inventions of their own; but were doubtless part of a common stock long in possession of the national mind: and if we meet with what is akin to them a hundred years higher up, there is nothing in the phenomenon that need surprise us. But there is one epithet applied to Messiah in this section too startling to be easily neutralised by such an explanation. He is called "*Woman's Son*:" and this too, in connexion with the last Judgment, as if to point the contrast between past humiliation and present glory: "*Kings*," it is said, "and mighty men will be in consternation, and their countenance will fall, and anguish will seize them, when they see that *Son of the Woman* sit upon the throne of his glory" (lxiii. 5). The expression, never repeated, is immediately changed: "The kings and all the earth will praise and exalt him who rules over all, and who was hid: for previously that *Son of Man* was hid, and the Most High reserved him in his might and revealed him to the elect: and the community of the holy and elect will be sown, and all the elect will stand

before him in that day" (lxii. 6-8). If we could entirely forget the Christian legend, we might perhaps, with Dillmann, consider the phrases, "Son of Man," "Son of Woman," interchangeable, and accept them both as expressing simply that Messiah, with all his glory, was still of human kind. We might cite the pathetic words of Job, "Man that is *born of a woman* is of few days and full of trouble," to show how naturally the birth-hour comes into the mind when an image is wanted of frail and suffering humanity. But, to bear this explanation, the phrase ought to be in current and idiomatic use; else, it would not speak for itself in this sudden and solitary instance: and of such currency there is no evidence. If, prior to the story of the Virgin Mary, Messiah had acquired the title of "Son of the Woman," it must have been in virtue of some theory about his birth, out of which that story itself has sprung. It is far from impossible that, could we recover the missing links of præ-Christian doctrine, such a chain of causation might be established. But so long as we stand in face only of this isolated text, and remember that the book which contains it has been for a millennium and a half in Christian custody, we incline to treat so exceptional a phrase as a corruption from the hand of an ecclesiastical copyist. The verse immediately preceding compares the consternation of "kings and mighty men" to the "travail of a woman ere her son is born." Whether this occurrence of the words "son" and "woman" in the antecedent lines can have led to the introduction of the questionable epithet, we must leave to Ethiopic scholars to decide.

The peculiarities of this section have led Hilgenfeld to maintain not only its later, but its Christian, origin as a whole. And often, no doubt, its imagery and even its phrases remind us of evangelical texts, and carry us more readily to the New Testament than to the Old. When we hear that for the unbeliever "it were better that he had never been born" (xxxviii. 2);—that "no idle word is spoken with impunity before God" (lxii. 3, lxvii. 9);—that the earth and death shall give up the dead entrusted to them at the judgment-call (li. 1);—that the Son of Man "sits on the throne of his glory," and that "all judgment is committed to him" (lxix. 27);—that, after the Judgment, the righteous will be "clothed with the garment of life" (lxii. 15), and "will be as the angels in heaven" (li. 4); we seem for the moment to be conversing with Jesus or with John. And when we read that at the advent, "the Lord of spirits will dwell over them, and they will *dwell and eat together with that Son of Man*" (lxii. 14), the words so familiar to us naturally recur, "As my Father hath appointed unto me a kingdom,

I appoint also unto you that ye shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (Luke xxii. 29); and "Verily, I say unto you, I shall not again drink of the fruit of the vine, till I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matt. xxvi. 29):—words which, as we know from Justin Martyr, were taken by the early Church in their obvious sense, viz. that Christ, on his return to Jerusalem, would eat and drink with his disciples.* But these coincidences, it must always be remembered, may be pleaded in evidence both ways; to prove that the Christian Scriptures have *furnished* the ideas; or, inversely, to prove that they have *borrowed* the ideas: borrowed them, that is, not from this or that particular book, but from the common heritage of beliefs which had descended to that age, and were preserved in every synagogue. The originality of the Christian Scriptures does not consist in the Messianic doctrine of the synoptical gospels and the Apocalypse: on the contrary, it is precisely here that we meet with what is purely Judaic and perishable in them,—with their necessary, but transitory, colouring of time and place: and, beyond affixing their ideal to the person of Jesus, they leave the traditional picture as they found it. Its features had doubtless *set* into many forms of thought and even expression, which could not fail to repeat themselves in different minds and flow from different pens: and the occasional concordances between the gospels and the less ancient part of the Book of Enoch are not more than we should expect from the fact that the primitive Christian Church was but a fresher form of Jewish synagogue. It is only in the case of very *special* phrases, such as—"Son of God," "Son of the Woman,"—which lie out of the known circle of Jewish Messianic ideas, yet within the compass of the Christian, that we feel authorised to suspect an interpolating hand.

If, however, we cannot, with Hilgenfeld, dismiss the Messianic section of our book as a Christian addition, neither can we, with Ewald, regard it as the original basis of the whole work. The highly-developed form of doctrine which it exhibits appears to us to require a relatively lower date: and, in its peculiarities of phraseology, it departs further than the prior and succeeding sections from the simplicity of the Old Testament model. Its characteristic name for Jehovah,—viz. "*the Lord of spirits*,"—is surely more modern than "*the Most High*," "*the Lord*," or simply, "*God*." The titles given to Messiah,—"*the Elect*,"—"the Elect before the world was,"—"the Righteous,"—"the Son of Man,"—as well as the function of *Judge* assigned to him,—are not likely, when once in use through earlier chapters, to have been dropped and lost sight

* Tryph. Jud. 51.

of by later contributors to the work, and exchanged for the image of the "white bullock." As claiming the most for Messiah, they must rather crown than commence the doctrine of his person. The citizens of the kingdom also are denoted by some new names, not, like the "sheep" of other chapters, pointing to distinction of *race*, but following the moral and religious type of the terms "Righteous" and "Elect;" *e.g.* they are called "Children of God," "Children of Heaven," "Righteous and Good,"—implying a more spiritual order of conceptions, into which the literature might rise, but from which it would be little likely to recede. On the whole, we are convinced that, in this section we have a maturer form of doctrine than in those which fix the place and time of the expected golden age, and obtain a reflection of the Jewish attitude of faith during the life of the parents or grandparents of our apostles.

It is not surprising, then, that we meet in this work so many anticipations of the Christian Scriptures. Apostles and Evangelists were born into its circle of ideas; and they remained within it even when a wider circle embraced them and enlarged their view. Here we find, a century before the first line of the New Testament was written, all the chief features of its doctrine respecting the "end of the world" and the "coming of the Son of Man:" the same theatre, Jerusalem;—the same time, relatively to the writer, the immediate generation,—the hour at hand;—the same harbingers,—wars and rumours of wars, and the gathering of Gentile armies against the elect;—the same deliverance for the elect,—the Advent of Messiah with the holy angels;—the same decisive solemnity,—the Son of Man on the throne of his glory, with all nations gathered before him;—the same award,—unbelievers to a pit of fire in the valley of Hinnom, and the elect to the halls of the kingdom, to eat and drink at Messiah's table;—the same accession to the society,—by the first resurrection sending up from Hades the souls of the pious dead;—the same renovation of the earth,—the old Jerusalem thrown away, and replaced by a new and heavenly;—the same metamorphosis of mortal men,—to be as the angels;—the same end to Messiah's time,—the second resurrection, and the "second judgment of eternity," consigning the wicked Angels to their doom;—and the same new creation, transforming the heavenly world, that it may answer to Paradise below. Here, in a book to which the New Testament itself appeals, we have the very drama of "last things" which reappears in the book of Revelations and in portions of the Gospels. Whence, then, has this scheme of doctrine come? and whither has it led us? Itself a misunderstanding of the Old Testament, it has entailed a corresponding misunderstanding of the New.

Spreading before us the successive stages of its development in Daniel, in the Sibyl, in the progressive sections of the Book of Enoch, we see the process laid bare of its actual growth from misconstrued and overstrained phrases of Jeremiah and Isaiah, its absorption into it of fresh mythological and legendary matter, and its shifting form and boundaries to suit the relentless progress of history and the wearisome delay of the end. A faith thus matured, however full of interest and pathos as a human phenomenon, it is impossible to invest with the character of objective revelation, or to regard as more authoritative than the allegories of Philo or the Chiliasm of Justin Martyr. Yet, following it down into Christendom, we find it released, by an ulterior misconception, from its geographical and historical conditions, and transformed into the extramundane doctrine of a General Resurrection and Judgment, with awards to an everlasting Hell or Heaven. The great immortal hope, the solemn fears of presaging conscience, have become clogged with material images repugnant alike to our kosmical knowledge and our spiritual apprehensions: while the prolonged expectation of a "Second Advent," to substitute another world for this, has not only been prolific in apocalyptic fanaticism, but has sunk the present human scene into the shade as a mere provisional existence, divine in its promise, but not in its realities. The person of Christ, disguised in that Messianic costume which, often with barbaric taste, scribes and rabbis had elaborated, and which his disciples were eager to fold round him, imperfectly reveals its simple lines of spiritual majesty, and rather commands the homage paid to external functions than wins the allegiance of inward reverence. The very terms habitually applied to him,—“King,” “Lord,” “Judge,”—are all borrowed from the antecedent theory of a theocratic fifth act to the historic drama, and express no personal lineaments: their meaning is wholly political, not religious. Till we are prepared to discharge from the Christian Scriptures, as the mere temporary vehicle of their higher significance, their whole inherited system of Messianic doctrine, the demonology, the “preaching to the spirits in prison,” the Parusia with its throne and judgment, the “Gehenna of fire,” the “reign of saints,” the “table of the kingdom,” and to penetrate behind this veil to the individuality of Jesus, expressed in his deepest words and his characteristic life, the divine essence of Christianity will not be reached, and its eternal truth will remain hid.

CURRENT LITERATURE:—BOOKS OF THE QUARTER
SUITABLE FOR READING-SOCIETIES.

Charles the Bold. Vols. I. and II. By John Foster Kirk. Murray.

[Exhaustive and minute in detail, but not entitling the author to the rank of historian.]

Abbeokuta, or the Cameroons Mountains. An Exploration. By Richard F. Burton. Tinsley.

[Very interesting in matter, though coloured by prejudice and affected in style.]

German Life and Manners as seen in Saxony at the Present Day. By Henry Mayhew. 2 vols. Allen and Co.

[Amusing, but characterised by strong anti-German prejudice, which renders it of little real value.]

A Bundle of Ballads. Edited by the Author of "Guy Livingstone." Tinsley.

[These so-called ballads might have been written by Guy Livingstone himself. Those who admire that hero may perhaps admire them.]

Bella Donna; or, the Cross before the Name. A Romance. By Gilbert Dyce. Bentley.

[A decidedly clever and original novel.]

Savage Africa. By Winwood Reade. Smith and Elder.

[The cleverly written work of a man about town, who has "done" West Africa.]

From Dan to Beersheba; or, Northern and Southern Friends. Chapman and Hall.

[A novel of American social life, both North and South, written by a fairly impartial Northerner.]

Sir Goodwin's Folly: a Story of the year 1795. By Arthur Looker. 3 vols. Chapman and Hall.

[Crowded with grotesque characters, and teeming with semi-sensation incident, but as a whole more ingenious than powerful.]

The Old House in Crosby Square. By Henry Holl. 2 vols. Sampson Low and Son.

[A story of long-delayed but overwhelming retribution. There are some effective "situations," but every thing is a good deal overdrawn.]

History of Friedrich II. of Prussia, called Frederick the Great. By Thomas Carlyle. Vol. IV. Chapman and Hall.

[In this volume Mr. Carlyle continues his paraphrase of Prussian history in his own peculiar region of semi-delirious ideas up to the commencement of the Seven-Years War. Amongst its special features are some magnificent battle-scenes, many wonderful personal sketches, and a detailed history of the relations between Frederick and Voltaire and Maupertuis.]

Meadowleigh: a Story of Country Life. By the Author of "The Ladies of Bever Hollow." Bentley.

[Very pleasant reading.]

Thackeray the Humourist and the Man of Letters. By Theodore Taylor. Hotten.

[A well-executed middle term between the numerous fugitive sketches of Thackeray's life and the complete biography of some future day.]

Court and Society from Elizabeth to Anne. Edited from the Papers at Kimbolton by the Duke of Manchester. 2 vols. Hurst and Blackett.

[Full of amusing gossip, some of it throwing curious light on public characters of the time, but not furnishing the reader of history with much new or important information.]

Doctor Jacob. By the Author of "John and I." 3 vols. Hurst and Blackett.

[A strikingly original and powerful novel.]

A Diplomat's Residence in Persia. By E. B. Eastwick, F.R.S. Smith, Elder, and Co.

[A readable book of Persian travels.]

Memoirs of Bishop Mackenzie. By Harvey Goodwin, D.D., Dean of Ely. Bell and Daldy.

[An interesting biography of the ill-fated head of the Universities' Mission in Southern Africa.]

Wylder's Hand. By T. Sheridan le Fanu. Bentley.

[A cleverly-constructed story, in which two widely different types of the selfish man of the world contend against each other in a chaos of scheming and intrigue.]

Words and Places. By the Rev. Isaac Taylor.

[A vast but ill-digested mass of etymological materials. Better arrangement and the revision of some untenable theories would have made it a valuable as well as a readable work.]

Host and Guest. A Book about Dinners, Wines, and Desserts. By A. V. Kirwan. Bell and Daldy.

[A chatty and amusing discourse on gastronomy, combined with much practical advice to givers of dinners.]

The Story of the Guns. By Sir James Emerson Tennant. Longman.

[An elaborate piece of special pleading in favour of Mr. Whitworth and his artillery. The evidence, however, is far from convincing.]

The Small House at Allington. By Anthony Trollope. Smith, Elder, and Co.

[This is Mr. Trollope's best novel. His range of character is wider, and his insight into the concealed influences of social life more subtle, in every successive work; while in this instance he has quite surpassed his previous efforts in the construction of an interesting story, apart from studies of character.]

The Siege of Jerusalem by Titus; with the Journal of a recent Visit to the Holy City, and a general Sketch of the Topography. By Thomas Lewin, M.A., F.S.A. Longman.

[Commendable for its careful antiquarian detail and technical description, but destitute of literary merit.]

Edinburgh and its Neighbourhood, Geological and Historical, with the Geology of the Bass Rock. Edinburgh: Adam Black.

[Hugh Miller's *novissima verba*, full of that entertaining mixture of geological science and local associations which forms the agreeable specialty of all his writings.]

Iron and Iron Workers. By Samuel Smiles. Murray.

[A work on a subject which, in Mr. Smiles's competent hands, abounds in interest, social, historical, and commercial.]

After Breakfast. By George Augustus Sala. Tinsley.

[A collection of rambling and discursive papers on out-of-the-way subjects, in Mr. Sala's most characteristic style. Some are very amusing, but not a few are too forced and artificial.]

LONDON:

ROBSON AND LEVEY, PRINTERS, GREAT NEW STREET,
FETTER LANE,

On the 31st March will be published,

In Demy 8vo., with Illustrations.

No. 1, to be continued Monthly, price 1s.,

THE FISHERMAN'S MAGAZINE

AND

REVIEW.

EDITED BY MR. CHOLMONDELEY PENNELL.

THE object of the projectors of the "FISHERMAN'S MAGAZINE" is, first and foremost, to offer to fishermen—"anglers" in generic phraseology—the advantage of a regular organ of their OWN.

Fishing has of late years become an established institution amongst all classes of these islands. There are, it is well known, hundreds of men who now spend their lives in its pursuit, thousands who devote to it a great part of their leisure, whilst the growing importance of the fisheries is evinced by perpetually recurring discussions in the press and in Parliament; yet, inexplicable as it appears, no attempt has ever hitherto been made to establish a Magazine devoted to Fish and Fishing. It may be replied, perhaps, that there are already many excellent publications which treat incidentally of these subjects. Granted. Still that is no reason why, in these days of prolific journalism, fishermen should be the only large and powerful body in the kingdom dependant upon charity for their literature, and compelled to glean their information from the columns of a number of papers professedly occupied more or less engrossingly by the Turf, the Ring, and other sporting matters of no special interest to them. To repeat, therefore: there seems to be no valid reason why fishermen should remain without a proper organ of their own, to represent their opinions and urge their interests,—at any rate, it is intended that they should themselves have the opportunity of pronouncing upon the question 'ay' or 'no.'

Thus much as to the primary purpose of the "Fisherman's Magazine." Its subsidiary object or scope is two-fold, and without accepting the term literally, may perhaps be best explained by the expression "Useful and Ornamental."

Amongst objects coming within the former rôle, the projectors propose to themselves more particularly—

To advocate the enactment and enforcing of sound fishery laws, and especially of an amendment in the present law as

regards fixed license or assessment duties for English salmon rivers ;

To encourage the development of pisciculture ;

And whilst viewing as of primary importance all that relates to the advancement of practical fishing, or the actual use of the rod and line, to graft upon it as far as possible the science of Ichthyology in a popular form,—without some knowledge, at least, of which no fisherman can be really a master of his craft.

Of less solid, though not therefore less considered topics to be embraced under the second category above indicated, may be mentioned—

Reviews of fishing books ;

Articles on german branches of Natural History ; and generally the introduction of such lighter matters, as will, it is hoped, render the pages of the Magazine not altogether unattractive to the ordinary reader.

In addition to a *résumé* of the fishing news of each month, the Magazine will contain articles by the most eminent writers on the different piscatory topics of the day, as well as occasional complete works in a serial form ; and it is the aim of the projectors to give the best practical information *combined with the requisite scientific and literary talent for placing that information before the public in its most advantageous form.*

In order more fully to represent the opinions of fishermen at large, it is also intended to give reports from time to time of the proceedings of the various Conservancy Associations and Fishing Clubs throughout the Kingdom ; and the especial attention of the Secretaries and Members of such Associations is called to this feature in the programme of the Magazine, with the request that they will be good enough to furnish the required reports and information for carrying it into effect.

It only remains to add that, under certain necessary restrictions, free discussion is invited on all matters of general interest within the limits before adverted to, and that letters and communications from correspondents addressed to the Editor will be gladly received, and will meet with every consideration.

Such are the objects and scope of the present serial. They can only be maintained, however, by an extended and permanent circulation ; and a confident appeal is therefore made to the *esprit de corps* of Fishermen—as a body, and individually—to come forward and lend their support to a

FISHERMAN'S MAGAZINE.

London, March, 1864.

LONDON : CHAPMAN & HALL, 193, PICCADILLY.

APRIL 1ST, 1864.

CHAPMAN AND HALL'S NEW PUBLICATIONS.

MR. CARLYLE'S **FREDERICK THE GREAT.**

In demy 8vo, with Portrait and Maps, Vol. IV., 20s.,

HISTORY OF **FRIEDRICH THE SECOND,** CALLED **FREDERICK THE GREAT.**

By **THOMAS CARLYLE.**

[Now ready.]

In 2 Volumes, post 8vo, with Illustrations,

THE **LIFE OF LAURENCE STERNE.**

By **PERCY FITZ-GERALD, M.A., M.R.I.A.**

[Now ready.]

In 1 Volume, demy 8vo, with Portrait,

THE **LIFE OF GENERAL WOLFE.**

By **R. WRIGHT.**

[Nearly ready.]

GEORGE MEREDITH'S NEW NOVEL.

In 3 Vols. post 8vo,

EMILIA IN ENGLAND.

By **GEORGE MEREDITH.**

Author of "The Ordeal of Richard Feverel," "The Shaving of Shagpat," &c. [Nearly ready.]

In post 8vo, with Map.

OUR **GARRISONS IN THE WEST;** OR, **SKETCHES IN BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.**

By **FRANCIS DUNCAN, M.A.,**

Fellow of the Geological Society; Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society; Member of Colonies' Committee, Society of Arts; D.C.L. King's College, N.S.; Lieutenant R.A.

[Now ready.]

In 1 Volume, demy 8vo, with Illustrations,

THROUGH **MACEDONIA TO THE ALBANIAN LAKES.**

By **MARY ADELAIDE WALKER.**

[Nearly ready.]

A New Edition, in 3 Volumes, fcap. 8vo,

ROBERT BROWNING'S POETICAL WORKS.

- VOL. I. LYRICS, ROMANCES, MEN AND WOMEN 7s. 0d.
II. TRAGEDIES, AND OTHER PLAYS 8s. 0d.
III. PARACELUS, CHRISTMAS EVE AND EASTER-DAY, AND SORDELLO 7s. 6d.

. Sold separately.

Sixth Edition, in Four Volumes, fcap. 8vo, with Portrait, 24s.

ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING'S POETICAL WORKS.

Including "AURORA LEIGH."

New and Cheaper Edition, post 8vo, with 40 Illustrations, 7s. 6d.

OLIVER GOLDSMITH.

A Biography. By **JOHN FORSTER.**

In demy 8vo, 22s.,

ENGLISH WRITERS.

THE WRITERS BEFORE CHAUCER,

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY SKETCH OF THE FOUR PERIODS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

By HENRY MORLEY.

"Mr. Morley does all that learning, industry, and a real love for the subject can do to complete the intellectual record from all remaining sources. . . . We do not hesitate to say that the work will be a monument of learning, and an essential portion of every complete library."—*Daily News*.

"Mr. Morley's history of English literature gives us hopes that the want of an adequate text-book on a most important subject may at last be worthily supplied. . . . The book is a very useful and good one, and holds a distinct place in English literature."—*The Reader*.

DYCE'S SHAKESPEARE.

"THE BEST TEXT OF SHAKESPEARE WHICH HAS YET APPEARED. . . . MR. DYCE'S EDITION IS A GREAT WORK, WORTHY OF HIS REPUTATION, AND FOR THE PRESENT IT CONTAINS THE STANDARD TEXT."—*Times*, January 20, 1864.

A New Edition, to be completed in Eight Volumes, demy 8vo, 10s. each,

THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE.

Edited by the REV. ALEXANDER DYCE.

This Edition is not a mere reprint of that which appeared in 1857; on the contrary, it will present a text very materially altered and amended from beginning to end, with a large body of critical Notes, almost entirely new, and with a Glossary, in which the language of the poet, his allusions to customs, &c., will be fully explained.

To be published every alternate Month. Vols. I. and II. now ready.

Collected Edition, in 3 Volumes, fcap. 8vo, 16s.,

HENRY TAYLOR'S PLAYS AND POEMS.

"PHILIP VAN ARTEVELDE," &c.

"The lovers of poetical literature will be glad to welcome, in a uniform and convenient shape, the various poems Mr. Taylor has given to the world. They are all in one or other degree remarkable. . . . Besides the author's *chef-d'œuvre*, 'Philip Van Artevelde,' we have here 'Isaac Comnenus,' 'Edwin the Fair,' 'A Sicilian Summer,' 'St. Clement's Eve,' 'The Eve of the Conquest,' and some minor poems."—*London Review*.

Third and Cheaper Edition, in 1 Volume, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.,

ROBA DI ROMA.

By W. W. STORY.

"Whoever reads this book will rise from its perusal as well acquainted with the out-of-doors life of Rome as if he had spent years in the Eternal City. Nothing calculated to fix the attention or excite the interest of a stranger is omitted by Mr. Story in the ample record of his experience, which teems with the most vivid recollections and is expressed by the most picturesque details. An enumeration of the contents of his volumes is like the bill of fare of a promising dinner, and the contents themselves resemble the dinner when the cookery is first-rate."—*Examiner*.

"Be the cause what it may, the fact is certain that people never get tired of living at Rome, and people apparently never get tired of reading about Rome. . . . All who have lived at Rome must be aware that Mr. Story has been long resident there, and has had unusual opportunities of learning to know that strange half-dead city as it lives and moves. We can commend his work to all persons who have either been to Rome, or think of going there."—*Spectator*.

In post 8vo, with Illustrations, 12s.

SPORT IN NORWAY, AND WHERE TO FIND IT;

Together with a Short Account of the Vegetable Productions of the Country. To which is added,
a List of the Alpine Flora of the Dovre Fjeld, and of the Norwegian Ferns.

By M. R. BARNARD, B.A.,

Late Chaplain to the British Consulate, Christiania, Norway.

"Mr. Barnard has here compiled a pleasant and instructive guide-book for such British sportsmen as wish to go in search of arduous and exciting hunting grounds. He maps out the whole country minutely, taking each "amt" or province in turn; tells where the rein-deer are to be found, and how they are easiest got at; and gives an immense amount of information about salmon fishing and salmon breeding. The gardener will find in this interesting book full particulars respecting the vegetable productions of the country, and the botanist is furnished with a complete list of the Alpine flora of the Dovre Fjeld."—*Daily News*.

In post 8vo, 8s. 6d.,

CURIOSITIES OF INDO-EUROPEAN TRADITION AND FOLK LORE.

By WALTER K. KELLY.

"This is a singularly interesting work—a perfect treasury of curiosities. The author of this volume brings chapter and verse to authenticate favourite legends and popular superstitions, and to enable us henceforth to 'believe as truth' what has hitherto only been 'believed as a fable.' We have before us the result of most praiseworthy industry and most elaborate research."—*Sun*.

In post 8vo, 5s.,

THE POCKET DATE BOOK;

Or, Classified Tables of Dates of the Principal Facts, Historical, Biographical, and Scientific, from the beginning of the World to the Present Time.

By WILLIAM L. R. CATES.

THE TIMES, November 28, 1863.

"Mr. Cates, in his *Pocket-book of Dates*, has really done good service. He is evidently a lover of historical accuracy, and wishes everyone to be like himself. In addition to a catalogue of names, the year of birth and death of each individual, his birth-place, and principal works, literary, military, artistic, or scientific, are also added, and the dry bones of chronology thereby made to assume a faint vitality. All this has been done carefully and well; great facts have not been overlaid by little ones, and much judgment has been shown in the omission of many subordinate events. We have only to add that the type and printing are clear and accurate, and that the 'get up' of the book adds another merit to those already mentioned."

Demy 8vo, 18s.,

THE LIFE OF LORD BOLINGBROKE,

SECRETARY OF STATE IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE.

By THOMAS MACKNIGHT.

"Mr. Macknight is successful in reviving in the reader's mind a very distinct image of Bolingbroke in all his grace, his force, and his reckless and insolent unscrupulousness; and the various events of his career are illustrated and connected with an intelligent knowledge of the times, and with honesty and good sense."—*Saturday Review*.

In 3 Volumes, demy 8vo, 50s.,

HISTORY OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF EDMUND BURKE.

By THOMAS MACKNIGHT.

"A valuable addition to our stock of biographies."—LORD MACAULAY.

"Mr. Macknight has completed his work with the same industry and good faith which were displayed in the previous volumes. He has collected many interesting details of Burke's domestic habits and character, and he has succeeded in showing that his private goodness was not unworthy of his extraordinary powers."—*Saturday Review*.

NEW SERIALS.

NEW WORK BY MR. CHARLES DICKENS.

IN MONTHLY PARTS, UNIFORM WITH THE ORIGINAL EDITIONS OF "PICKWICK," "DAVID COPPERFIELD," &c.

On Saturday, April 30th, will be published, Part I., price 1s., of

OUR MUTUAL FRIEND.

By CHARLES DICKENS.

To be completed in Twenty Monthly Parts.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS BY MARCUS STONE.

NEW SERIAL BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

TO BE COMPLETED IN TWENTY MONTHLY PARTS, UNIFORM WITH "ORLEY FARM."

Now ready, Parts I. to IV., price 1s. each,

CAN YOU FORGIVE HER?

By ANTHONY TROLLOPE,

Author of "Dr. Thorne," "Rachel Ray," &c.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

NEW WORK BY CHARLES LEVER.

Now ready, Parts I. to V., price 1s. each,

LUTTRELL OF ARRAN.

By CHARLES LEVER,

Author of "Harry Lorrequer," "Charles O'Malley," &c.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS BY "PHIZ."

On March 31st, in demy 8vo, with Illustrations, No. I., price 1s.,

THE

FISHERMAN'S MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

EDITED BY CHOLMONDELEY PENNELL.

In Imperial 4to, to be completed in Twelve Monthly Parts,

THE

FARM HOMESTEADS OF ENGLAND.

A Collection of Plans of English Homesteads existing in different Districts of the Country, carefully selected from the most approved Specimens of Farm Architecture, to illustrate the Accommodation required under various modes of Husbandry; with a Digest of the Leading Principles recognised in the Construction and Arrangement of the Buildings.

Edited by J. BAILEY DENTON, M. INST. C.E., F.G.S.,

Engineer to the General Land Drainage and Improvement Company.

Parts X. and XI. just published.

CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193, PICCADILLY.

Bradbury & Evans,]

[Printers, Whitefriars.

2

to.

W.

ected
ired
Con-

riars.

CONTENTS.

- I. The Apocalypse of St. John.
- II. Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy's Letters.
- III. The Provincial Assemblies of France.
- IV. Ireland.
- V. Charles the Bold.
- VI. The Races of the Old World.
- VII. The Germanic Diet.
- VIII. Sterne and Thackeray.
- IX. Early History of Messianic Ideas.
- X. Current Literature :—Books of the Quarter suitable
for Reading-Societies.

